

JUN 14 1921 **DOUBLE NUMBER, PRICE 3S.**
 The CLASSICAL QUARTERLY and CLASSICAL REVIEW are the Organs of the Classical Association. The QUARTERLY is published in January, April, July, and October; the REVIEW in the other eight months.

The Classical Review

EDITORS { J. T. SHEPPARD, M.A., King's College, Cambridge.
 { R. W. LIVINGSTONE, M.A., Corpus Christi College, Oxford.

Board of Management:

Prof. R. A. CONWAY, Litt.D., F.B.A., *Chairman.*
 Prof. J. F. DOBSON, M.A., *Hon. Treasurer.* Prof. A. G. CLARK, Litt.D., F.B.A., *Hon. Secretary.*
 Prof. GILBERT MURRAY, Litt.D., D.Litt., F.R.S., F.B.S., *With the Chairman, Treasurer, and Secretary, representing the Council of the Classical Association.*
 Prof. O. FLAMSTEAD, WALTERS, M.A. A. B. GODLEY, D.Litt., *Representing the Oxford Philological Society.*
 Prof. SIR WILLIAM RIDGEWAY, D.Litt., Litt.D., *Representing the Cambridge Philological Society.*
 With the co-operation of Prof. WM. GARDNER HALE, University of Chicago;
 Prof. T. G. TUCKER, Litt.D., Melbourne.

Vol. XXXV

MAY-JUNE, 1921

Nos. 3, 4

CONTENTS

	PAGE		PAGE
EDITORIAL NOTES AND NEWS	49	REVIEWS—continued:	
VERSION: HUGO JOHNSON	50	Res Metrica (Hardie). D. S. ROBERTSON	72
ORIGINAL CONTRIBUTIONS:		Latin Epigraphy (Sandys). W. M. CALDER	73
Some Translations. A. D. GODLEY	51	HÉPI TAMOT (Buddenhagen). H. J. ROSE	75
The <i>Rhesus</i> . A. C. PEARSON	52	A Study of Women in Attic Inscriptions (McClees). H. RICHARDSON	76
The Technique of Virgil's Verse. C. E. S. HEADLAM	61	Ancient Armenia (Laurent). A. J. TOYNEER	76
An Echo of Euripides in Propertius. WILLIAM KERRY	64	The Style and Literary Method of Luke (Cadbury). W. K. LOWTHER CLARKE	77
NOTES:		SHORT NOTICES:	
CIL. I. 1336 (= VI. 335). J. WHATMOUGH	65	Juristische Papyri. A. S. H.	78
Note on Ignat. <i>Ep. Ad Eph.</i> XX. E. H. BLAKENEY	66	Restrepo's Semantics. J. P. F.	78
Horatiana. J. P. POSTGATE	66	Sallust. H. E. BUTLER	79
Varro's <i>Quaestiones Plautinarum Libri V.</i> W. M. LINDSAY	67	Orazio Lirico. H. E. BUTLER	79
REVIEWS:		The Gentilive of Value in Latin and other Constructions with Verbs of 'Rating'. E. A. SONNENSCHN	80
Rostagni's <i>Imo</i> . A. E. HOUSMAN	67	Phases of Corruption in Roman Administration in the Last Half-Century of the Roman Republic. W. W. H.	80
Aristotle's Four Books of <i>Meteorologica</i> (Fobes). ST. GEORGE STOCK	69	CORRESPONDENCE:	
The Works of Aristotle translated into English: <i>Oeconomica</i> (Forster). ST. GEORGE STOCK	70	R. G. BURY	81
The Works of Aristotle translated into English: <i>Atheniensium Respublica</i> (Kanyon). ST. GEORGE STOCK	70	SUMMARIES OF PERIODICALS	81
		BOOKS RECEIVED	84

(The Editors request that books for review be sent, not to them direct, but to the Publishers.)

LONDON: JOHN MURRAY, ALBEMARLE STREET, W.
 NEW YORK: G. E. STECHERT & CO., 151-155, WEST 25TH STREET.

Price for Single Numbers, 1s. 6d. net. Yearly Subscription, 12s. net, post free; U.S.A. \$3.
 Combined Yearly Subscription for the CLASSICAL QUARTERLY and the CLASSICAL REVIEW,
 25s. net, post free; U.S.A. \$6.25.

The Society for the Promotion of Roman Studies,

19 BLOOMSBURY SQUARE, LONDON, W.C. 1

President: PROFESSOR J. S. REID, D.Litt.

THE Society embraces the history, art, and archaeology of Rome, Italy, and the Roman Empire, down to about A.D. 700.

In connexion with the Hellenic Society, the Roman Society maintains a joint library of Greek and Roman art, archaeology and history, and a collection of lantern slides and photographs. Members may borrow books and slides, and these can be sent through the post.

Communications respecting books and slides should be made to the Librarian.

Afternoon meetings for the reading and discussion of papers are held at Burlington House, W. Notices of these are sent to all members.

Life-membership composition for persons over fifty years of age ten guineas, for others fifteen guineas. Annual subscription one guinea. There is at present no entrance fee.

Persons desirous of joining the Society should communicate with the Secretary.

THE JOURNAL OF ROMAN STUDIES (11 x 7½ inches) is published by the Society in half-yearly parts, and sent post free to all members.

The papers in Vols. I.-V. include articles by English, American, French, and other foreign scholars, and amongst others:

ANDERSON, J. G. C. The Quinquennial Neronia.
ASHBY, Dr. THOS. (of Rome). Recent Excavations at Ostia.

ASHBY, Dr. THOS. (of Rome). Roman Malta.
BARRER, Miss E. K. The Catacombs of St. Callixtus.
BONI, Commendatore. Recent Discoveries on the Palatine at Rome.

BRUCE, Viscount. Religion in the Roman Empire.
CAJONAT, Prof. (of Paris). A Roman Customs List.
CALISE, Prof. W. M. Roman Inscriptions in Asia Minor.

CALZA, GUIDO (of Rome). Roman Art at Ostia.
CUMONT, Prof. (of Belgium), and ANDERSON, J. G. C. Three New Inscriptions.

DEBIAU, Prof. British Centurions.
DOMANIEWICZ, Prof. The Magnus Miliar.

DOUGLAS, Miss. June Sossian.
ESCALE, Mrs. A Statue in the Palazzo Barberini.
HAVERFIELD, Prof. Roman Coast Defences of Eastern Britain.

HAVERFIELD, Prof. Roman London.
HAVERFIELD, Prof., and H. STUART-JONES. Romano-British Art.

MACDONALD, G. The Corbridge Gold Coins.
KERNACH, SALOMON (Prof.) A Bronze Statuette of Zeus.
REID, Prof. J. S. Roman Funic Law.

REID, Prof. J. S. Human Sacrifices at Rome.
STRONG, Mrs. S. A. The Archaeological Exhibition of 1911 at Rome.

WARDE FOWLER, W. The original meaning of the word "Sacer."

WARDE FOWLER, W. Munera Picta.

Vol. VI. (delayed by the War) is in active preparation in the press.

THE CLASSICAL ASSOCIATION

THE objects of the Classical Association are to promote the development and maintain the well-being of classical studies, and in particular (a) to impress upon public opinion the claim of such studies to an eminent place in the national scheme of education; (b) to improve the practice of classical teaching; (c) to encourage investigation and call attention to new discoveries; (d) to create opportunities for intercourse among lovers of classical learning.

Membership of the Association is open to men and women alike. The annual subscription is 5s. (life composition, £3 15s.), and there is an entrance fee of 5s. (not charged to Libraries). Members receive a copy of the annual *Proceedings* of the Association and, on payment of 2s. 6d., of *The Year's Work in Classical Studies* (both post free). They may also obtain the *Classical Review* and *Classical Quarterly* at reduced prices, provided that the subscriptions be paid before January 31st in each year. Subscriptions sent in later than that date must be at the rates offered to the general public.

Inquiries and applications for membership should be addressed to the Hon. Treasurer, Mr. E. Norman Gardiner, 2, The College, Epsom; or to either of the Hon. Secretaries, Professor Pearson, Etonfield, King's Gap, Hoylake, Cheshire, and Rev. G. C. Richards, Oriel College, Oxford; or to the Hon. Secretary of any of the district Branches—viz., Miss Hilda Livesey, 155, Oswald Road, Chorlton-cum-Hardy, near Manchester; Miss Margaret Hooker, Secondary School for Girls, Erdington, Birmingham; Mr. H. A. Ormerod, The University, Liverpool; Mr. E. P. Barker, 426, Woodborough Road, Nottingham; Miss Wilkinson, Badminton House, Clifton, Bristol; Mr. Basil Anderton, The Public Library, New Bridge Street, Newcastle-upon-Tyne; Miss E. Strudwick, City of London School for Girls, Carmelite Street, E.C.4; Miss M. E. Pearson, University Registry, Cathays Park, Cardiff; Mr. E. E. Bibby, The University, Leeds; Miss M. L. Newman, 7, College Street, Sheffield; Mr. E. D. T. Jenkins, University College, Aberystwyth; Mr. D. Emrys Evans, University College, Bangor; and Professor Dawson, Northcote House, Apollo Bander, Bombay.

nd
al
to
te
al
gs.
al
al
re
st
n.
he
e,
py
n-
or
l;
d-
ew
ol
y.
L.
re,
or

sp
in
w
r
a
N
b
a
U
p
R
C
fi
c
S
in
c
a
t
C
d
f
R
t
a
c
c
R
e
s
e
v
h
c
v

The Classical Review

MAY—JUNE, 1921

EDITORIAL NOTES AND NEWS

WE are delighted to hear from a correspondent of a revival of the humanities in Norway. Dr. Gunnar Rudberg, writing in the *Pedagogisk Tidsskrift*, 1920, tells us that Latin had, so long ago as 1896, practically disappeared from Norwegian education, and Greek had been completely abandoned. A recent agitation for their revival, supported by Universities, clergymen, teachers, and pupils, found a leader in Professor Raeder, Rector of the Christiania Cathedral School. He proposed at first simply a course of Latin, to be combined with French, for gymnasia. Subsequently the proposal developed into a demand for a three year Latin course of 22 hours a week, with Greek added for 6 to 7 hours a week in the last two years. The influential Teachers' Council, which at first ignored the demand, was convinced by the reformers, and took up the cause. The Education Department, which appears to be not unlike such bodies elsewhere, at first resisted the demand for Greek, on the specious ground that it is best to concentrate on one ancient language. But the enthusiasts triumphed in the end, and the Storting carried the scheme without debate. The first arts examination under the new conditions will be held in 1923. Greek is optional, but is actually beginning in four cathedral schools and one gymnasium. We congratulate Rector Raeder and wish the new movement success.

* * *

Professor Harrower sends us from Aberdeen an address, delivered last spring, on 'A New Greek Graduation Course,' which contains many witty

NO. CCLXXXI. VOL. XXXV.

contributions to the general problem of the fight for Classics. The fight is necessary in Scotland. In the Ordinary Graduation Classes of all four Universities only 118 students were taking Greek last year. Professor Harrower thinks that the dwindling number of candidates is partly due to the 'repulsive character' of the entrance test for admission to the classes. But he rightly holds that to lower the standard for linguistic students would be fatal. Grammar, so long as it is taught and used as 'a labour-saving device,' not as an end in itself, is necessary. The ungrammatical scholar is, in fact, a charlatan. Nevertheless, there is a place in every University for a course on Greek life and thought, studied by means of translations. Professor Harrower's scheme includes Greek history, and above all Thucydides, Greek sculpture, and a course of literature in English versions. That such a course should be one of the recognised subjects qualifying for the degree of M.A. in the Department of Law and History is a notable achievement.

* * *

The Memorial to the late Dr. R. M. Burrows at King's College, London, is to take the form of a prize or scholarship for Greek. Subscriptions may be sent to Prof. H. G. Atkins at the College.

* * *

Mr. Norman H. Baynes sends us the following account of the work done in his Ancient History Circle in London:

When in 1913 I was appointed Lecturer in Ancient History in the Evening School of

D

History at University College, London, my work was to give weekly lectures on the history of Greece and Rome down to the reign of Constantine; the lectures were delivered at 6.0 p.m. and were followed by a class. The year's course could be taken independently, or could form the first year of a four years' course for a Diploma in History. Most of the students were L.C.C. teachers in Elementary Schools. In these conditions with a large audience (sixty or more) it was difficult for student and lecturer to come into personal contact, or for the students to get to know each other. The solution seemed to be that we should meet informally outside the lecture-room. In a University Extension Course, where the lecturer only visits the town to deliver his lecture, this might be impossible: where the lectures are delivered in a University, it is simple. We first met for tea in University College, and the meeting was a success; then, in March, 1914, we arranged a Saturday afternoon visit to the British Museum, when Prof. Ernest Gardner acted as our guide, and on leaving the Museum we took possession of a dairy in Bloomsbury, and then and there decided to form ourselves into an organisation which might help us to know each other and might widen our interest in Ancient History. Thus the Ancient History Circle came into being, its membership open to all students (including Extension students) and members of the teaching staff of the University. A Student Committee was elected, and from the students Mr. J. E. Bishop was chosen as General Secretary and Treasurer. To his energy and ability our success is primarily due. I have acted as Organising Secretary. The activities of the Circle were continued throughout the war. Many scholars helped us by

lecturing to the Circle: Prof. Haverfield on Roman Towns under the Empire, Principal Burrows on Minoan Crete, Dr. Leaf on the Troad, Prof. Bury on Greek Thought after Alexander, Prof. Butler on Roman Education and on Apuleius, Mr. G. F. Hill on An Ancient Sea-Port (Gaza), Mr. Matheson on Epictetus, Mr. Cary on The Conspiracy of Catiline, Mr. H. I. Bell on Papyri, and Mr. Sheppard on Greek Religion, on the *Oedipus Tyrannus*, and on the *Agamemnon*. The activities of the Circle have taken many forms: debates on ancient history subjects, 'Symposia' (short papers written by students), the reading of Greek plays in an English translation, social meetings at the beginning of the session, informal dinners (at one of which, in conjunction with the Historical Society, we entertained Professor Stanojević of Belgrade), while every year's programme has included whole-day walks (on Saturdays) in the country: these have proved invaluable. This spring the energy of Miss R. M. Hill, of Holloway College, resulted in the production by the Circle of the *Hippolytus* (in Gilbert Murray's translation).

The advantages of this experiment have been: (i.) The lecturer has been enabled to become intimately acquainted with his students, (ii.) students have formed friendships and have in consequence co-operated in their work, (iii.) the interest of past students has been maintained when the course of lectures has come to an end and, further, (iv.) students are not restricted to that view of history which happens to be presented by their lecturer, while they have an opportunity of hearing and seeing in the flesh the scholars whose books they read, so that those books acquire for them a new and living significance.

THE CLASSICAL ASSOCIATION will meet at Cambridge, August 2 to 6. Invitations have been sent to Transatlantic scholars through the American Philological Association. Accommodation at fixed charges can be obtained for men in men's Colleges, and for women in women's, by application to Mr. G. Grant Morris, of Corpus Christi College, Cambridge.

CHARLES BAUDELAIRE.

ἄγκυραν, ναύκληρε Χάρων, χάλα· αἰρόμεθ' ἤδη
γῆθεν ἀσηθέντες λαίφρσιν ἀκροτάτοις.
κύμα μὲν ἤδ' νέφος μέλαν ἦντε πίσσα φερέσθω,
πλήρεα δ' ἡμετέρην γ' ἴσθι φάει κραδίην.
ἔγχεε δαυιλίως Ἑγείνης φάρμακα λυγρά·
ἱμείρω—φλεγέθει πῦρ τόσον ἀμφι φρεσί—
Τάρταρος εἶτε μένει μακάρων μέ τις ὄρμος, ἀδελον
πρηνὴς ἰέμενος ῥοῦν κάτω κάναβιον.

HUGO JOHNSON.

TIME'S up, old shipmate Death! The anchor
lift—
The country bores us. Up! Full canvas
dight.
Tho' seas and clouds as black as ink may drift,
Our hearts, thou knowest well, are full of
light.
Fill high thy poison'd cup; 'twill brace us well.
We would—such fire burns fierce within our
brain—
Plunge down a gulf—be Heaven our port or
Hell—
Plunge down the unknown gulf, to live again.

LEONARD COURTNEY.

ORIGINAL CONTRIBUTIONS

SOME TRANSLATIONS.

ON the hypothesis that we all aim at some apparent good, it is natural, though quite unprofitable, to ask why so many enterprising scholars continue to translate Virgil and Horace into English verse. Conventionally, a translator's object is defined as the production of something which shall affect us in the same way as the *Aeneid* and the *Odes* affected the Augustan public. But most translators are quite as intelligent as the majority of educated persons; and they must therefore be aware, first, that we do not know what the effect of the *Aeneid* or the *Odes* on the contemporary public really was; and next, that whatever it was it must have been conditioned by metrical form. The appeal of Virgil and Horace must have been to the ear, through rhythm and metre; and their rhythm and metre had qualities which English cannot possess. The effect here cannot really be reproduced. 'The Virgilian harmony,' Charles Lamb says, 'is not translatable, but by substituting harmonious sounds in another language for it.' And where shall these harmonious sounds be found?

A very useful little volume—*Early Theories of Translation*, by Professor Flora Ross Amos—gives an account of what English translators have said about their dangerous trade since its first beginning. 'Dryden,' we are told (p. 160), 'frequently complains of the difficulty of translation into English metre, especially when the poet to be translated is Virgil. The use of rhyme causes trouble. "It is certainly a constraint even to the best poets, and those who make it with most ease."' Nevertheless Dryden used it, and moderns do likewise. Here, for instance, is a translation by Dr. Way of the first three books of the *Aeneid* (Latin and English facing each other—a very handy volume). Dr. Way is an excellent scholar and a practised translator of the classics into verse. Where he fails few can hope to succeed. But how different is his nar-

rative from Virgil's! This (for instance is how he renders *Aen.* II. 438 and following lines:

But here behold so mighty a conflict as though
beside
There were none other war, nor any in all the
city that died;
So quenchless the battle-fire burns, so rusheth
the Argive array
On the halls. To the leaguered gate the shield
wedge forces its way;
To the walls cling scaling ladders, and step by
step thereby
Foes mount to assault the gate; their left hands
lift on high
Their shields for a screen from the darts, their
right hands clutch the while
At the battlements . . .

Dr. Way knows very well that it is a hopeless task. 'The marvellous metrical effects of a poet like Virgil,' he says, 'can be reproduced in no measure of our more rugged speech.' Rhyme is responsible; the recurrent assonance inevitably makes pauses, breaks of continuity, which are not found in the fluent sequence of a series of Virgilian hexameters. Further, in order I suppose to have a long line corresponding to the Latin hexameter, Dr. Way has saddled himself with a jingling metre which may become tiresome. Perhaps the ordinary heroic couplet (handled in the manner not of Pope but of Morris) is more adaptable; certainly Mr. E. E. Sikes has produced thus an elegant and readable translation of Musaeus' *Hero and Leander*. However, on the whole it is probable that the continuity of hexameters, Greek or Latin, would be best reproduced by blank verse—good blank verse; it is true that this is beyond the reach of most of us, and 'it needs heaven-sent moments for such skill.' Nothing short of a Miltonic elevation is good enough for the best hexameter speech or narrative; yet when Homer nods or Virgil plods (as happens every now and then) the ordinary arrangement of English words in a line of ten syllables or so will do well enough. So Mr. Mooney—no Milton, but a respectable versifier—has published a

very useful version, mostly in blank verse, of the *Minor Poems of Virgil*, which never rise to the 'grand style.'

There can be but few scholars who—even in these days when 'elegant' scholarship is at a discount—have not translated, or are not translating, or will not in the near future translate Horace. It becomes a habit. They do it again and again. As, driven by some irrational but irresistible instinct, the murderer returns to the scene of his crime, so too—well, anyhow, here are three more translators to add to the list. Mr. Warren H. Cudworth aims at making his English as externally like Horace's Latin as possible. To this end 'the original meters have been approximated in order to impress the eye and ear as do the Latin strophes; Horace's sententious brevity and his order of words in working out his thought have been imitated; the verse has been given all possible smoothness of flow and accuracy of rime'—and in fact it is an entirely inoffensive and rather laudable enterprise. Mr. Cudworth has a standard 'meter' for alcaics—the four-lined stanza, eight syllables to the line—a stanza with a short fourth line for sapphics, and so forth:

Evøe ! new fears my bosom tear ;
My pulses, filled with Bacchus, quake ;
Evøe ! O spare me, Liber, spare ;
No more thy potent thyrsus shake.

There is no harm at all in Mr. Cudworth; nor in Mr. Hubert Dynes Ellis, who has some spirited versions: notably a translation of *Faune Nympharum fugientum amator* into the *Love in the Valley* metre.

Very different is the method of the veteran Mr. Stebbing (*Some Masterpieces of Latin Poetry Thought into English Verse*). Mr. Stebbing expands and para-

phrases; he would hardly call himself a translator. Horace and Catullus are made to say at some length something resembling what they have as a matter of fact chosen to say briefly; 'O Fons Bandusiae'—sixteen Latin lines—is expanded into no less than forty English, and not too lucid lines at that. However, it has no doubt been a labour of love for Mr. Stebbing, and the world is none the worse for it. It is interesting to note that a scholar who took his degree sixty-five years ago can be quite as unconventional a metrist, in matters of accent and quantity, as any 'Georgian' of our day.

Translators of Latin lyric poetry there will be as long as we are still allowed to learn Latin. But it will always be a difficult business. English 'vers libre' is a dull ineffectual medium; we cannot dispense with rhyme, as a general rule; and rhyme does somehow cramp the free fluency of Horace's alcaics, though not of course as much as it hampers the translator of Virgilian hexameters. Those are wise who use rhyme for the rendering of elegiacs (especially the Ovidian elegiac), or to translate quite short and pointed pieces where rhyme helps to point the sting (as in Mr. Lothian's often excellent versions of epigrams from the Greek Anthology), or who employ blank verse where it is obviously a quite adequate medium, in the translation of the dialogue of Greek tragedy, or even Lucretian hexameters. Mr. R. C. Trevelyan uses it with distinguished success, no less for Lucretius than for the *Ajax* and the selections from the *Oresteia* which he has prepared as an acting version for the Cambridge players.

A. D. GODLEY.

Oxford.

THE RHESUS.

PROF. MURRAY's translation of the *Rhesus* and the support which he has given to the advocates of its authenticity, have revived interest in a problem which has been little discussed in recent years. In the view taken he runs counter to the general opinion, which

has tended to acquiesce in the conclusion that the play is spurious. Since the publication of Prof. Murray's book several scholars have written on the subject. In *Class Quart.* VIII. 206, Mr. E. Harrison published some statistics bearing on the comparative

frequency of spondees and iambi in the first and third feet of the trimeter, which tend to show that the number of spondees occupying these positions in the *Rhesus* is considerably larger than in other appropriately selected plays of Aeschylus, Sophocles, and Euripides. In other words, the first half of the verse in the *Rhesus* is abnormally heavy. This fact is a piece of evidence making against the genuineness of the play, but its discoverer did not pretend that it could be regarded as decisive. Other critics have supported the claims of Euripides. Dr. Leaf, in the course of an elaborate examination of the legend of Rhesus (*J.H.S.* XXXV. 1) comes to the conclusion—anticipated by Vater—that our *Rhesus* was composed for the occasion of the founding of Amphipolis in 437 B.C., when, according to the authority of Polyænus (*Strat.* VI. 53), Hagnon conveyed home the bones of Rhesus. He proves at most that the occasion was suitable for the composition of a play on the subject; but does not touch the question whether the play which has been handed down to us was that which, as we shall see, Euripides undoubtedly wrote. While accepting Leaf's conclusion unreservedly, Mr. G. C. Richards (*Class. Quart.* X. 192-197) determines in the negative the question whether or not there is anything in the text to prevent us from believing that it was composed about 440 B.C. Put in that form, the thesis is not necessarily in conflict with that which finds a difficulty in acknowledging the authorship of Euripides. The points chiefly urged will be considered later on. We now come to Mr. W. H. Porter's interesting edition of the play (Cambridge, 1916). He examines the evidence for and against with careful impartiality, and, holding that the onus of proof rests upon those who impugn the genuineness of the play, concludes that, while there are many grounds of suspicion, the facts adduced are insufficient to overthrow the external evidence in its favour. Lastly, Prof. William N. Bates, of Philadelphia, in the *Transactions of the American Philological Association* (XLVII. 5) makes light of the peculiarities of diction, and finds the Euripidean character of the style unmistakable. He suggests that the scene in which Diomed and Odysseus elude the pursuit of the Chorus is parodied in the *Acharnians*, 280 ff., where the Chorus attack Dicaeopolis. But there is no obvious sign of parody, and the resemblances are not sufficiently close to produce conviction.

No one believes nowadays that Aeschylus or Sophocles was the author, although the style with its occasional stateliness of diction, shown especially in a fondness for compound adjectives, has a superficial affinity to the former.¹ But a closer scrutiny of the language demonstrates that it belongs to a much later era, and that the play, if not written by Euripides, was at any rate subject to his influence. What, then, are the causes which have impelled successive critics to throw doubt upon the traditional ascription? Putting aside for the moment the external evidence, and confining ourselves to the text of the play, we find that the broad grounds of objection are: (1) The absence of two of Euripides' most prominent characteristics—his pathos and his sententiousness;² and (2) a marked difference from his ordinary style of writing. The first point is obvious and needs no further emphasis. The second will require some elucidation, but the general impression cannot be better put than in Prof. Murray's words: 'The ordinary style of Euripides,' he says, 'is full, flexible, lucid, anti-theatrical, studiously simple in vocabulary' . . . whereas 'that of the *Rhesus* is comparatively terse, rich, romantic, not shrinking from rare words or strong

id

¹ Cf. e.g. Paley's edition, p. 8. Rolfe's paper will be discussed presently.

² Paley points out that 980 ff. are an exception: ὁ παιδοποιὸς συμφοραὶ, πόνοι βροτῶν · | ὡς ὅστις ὑμᾶς μὴ κακῶς λογιζέται | ἅπαις διότρεϊ καὶ τεκῶν θάψει τέκνα. It is instructive to compare the dialectical development of the same thesis in *Med.* 1081 ff. He might have added 758-760, where the speaker makes the extraordinary admission that a glorious death may be painful to the dead man, though a source of renown to the survivors! This seems to be intended as a counterblast to Eur. *Tro.* 633, Soph. *El.* 1170, in which the freedom from pain enjoyed by the dead is advanced as a reason for preferring death to a wretched life.

colour.¹ The problem of the *Rhesus* is to discover why, if it is genuine, Euripides appears on this occasion only² without his most characteristic attributes. There are explanations conceivable which are excluded by the facts. Thus it might be thought that the *Rhesus* was the work of a young man influenced by Aeschylean traditions, who had not yet developed his own peculiar mannerisms.³ Prof. Murray pertinently supplies the answer by remarking that the fragments of the *Peliades*, Euripides' earliest play, are in his ordinary style, and quite unlike the *Rhesus*.⁴ He himself prefers to suppose that the peculiarities of the *Rhesus* are attributable to the nature of the play, which must be criticised, not as an ordinary tragedy, but as having been, like the *Alcestis*, the substitute for a satyr-play.⁵ We must beware of being led into deep waters, for the fathoming of which we possess no sounding-line. If, however, we treat the *Alcestis* as providing a standard for the measurement of the so-called 'prosatyric' plays, it is surely a weak point in Prof. Murray's case that no one ever feels any doubt about the Euripidean authorship of that play. Where indeed is his pathetic power so movingly exhibited? Let the reader peruse the latter part of the *Rhesus*, and pass immediately to the first half of the *Alcestis*, and he cannot fail to be conscious of a change of atmosphere.

In favour of the comparison it is alleged that the *Rhesus*, if tested by the number of words contained in it which are not found elsewhere in Euripides, occupies a place between the *Cyclops* and the *Alcestis*, and that all three show

an excess of variation from the normal. I do not believe that these figures are of much value.⁶ They might, of course, be used in favour of those who deny the authorship of Euripides altogether; but, if restricted to the purpose of establishing an affinity with a particular class of play—that is, the satyric or prosatyric—it would be necessary to show a similarity not in the number but in the quality of the eccentricities. But they do not reveal anything of the kind. The non-Euripidean peculiarities of the *Rhesus* comprise a large number of compounds, and a substantial proportion of ἄπαξ εἰρημένα; they exhibit in certain particulars a distinct flavour of Homer; but they do not approach in the slightest degree to the language of comedy or to colloquial speech.

Thinking that it might be possible by a fresh examination of the language to reach some more definite conclusion, I went through the play carefully in order to discover whether in vocabulary and phraseology—especially the latter, because vocabulary is the less significant of the two—it approaches more nearly to the usage of Euripides, Sophocles, or Aeschylus. I might have saved a good deal of trouble, if I had made myself acquainted before starting with the results obtained by Hermann, Hagenbach, Eysert, and Rolfe;⁷ but I preferred to work independently. Hermann and Hagenbach, whose results have been incorporated by the later critics, both pronounced against the traditional view. Eysert, on the other hand, claims to have shown that no argument can be drawn from the language against the authorship of Euripides. A specimen of his figures may be given, which is among the less favourable to his thesis. He finds 28 ἄπαξ εἰρημένα in the *Rhesus* as compared with 40 in the *Phoenissae*, 36 in the *Ion*,

¹ p. viii.

² The *Cyclops* must be left out of account for various reasons: the peculiarities of metre and diction which distinguish it have no parallel in the *Rhesus*.

³ Crates of Mallus (schol. *Rhes.* 524) excused an astronomical error on the ground that Euripides was a young man when he composed the play. The same assumption is the last stronghold of modern critics who defend its authenticity.

⁴ The same point is made by F. Hagenbach (*de Rheso tragedia*, Basilae, 1863, p. 30).

⁵ Dindorf made the same suggestion (ed. Oxon. p. 560 f.), but seems subsequently to have abandoned it (*Poet. Scen.*, p. 21).

⁶ Using Beck's index, which is notoriously untrustworthy, I counted 165 instances (as against Murray's 177). By a rough comparison with the *Bacchae* and the *Hippolytus* for the letter α alone, I found the proportion for the *Bacchae* to be much larger, and for the *Hippolytus* slightly smaller.

⁷ G. Hermann, *Opuscula*, III. 262 ff.; L. Eysert, *progr.* Lips. 1891; J. C. Rolfe, *Harvard Studies*, IV. (1893), 61 ff.

35 in the *I.T.*, 32 in the *I.A.*, and 31 in the *Bacchae*. These totals yield percentages of 2·81 for the *Rhesus*, 2·33 for the *I.T.*, 2·27 for the *Phoenissae*, 2·23 for the *Bacchae*, and 2·22 for the *Ion*. Rolfe, whose treatise is a valuable account of the whole controversy, concludes (p. 82) that, if it is borne in mind that we possess many more plays of Euripides than of Aeschylus or Sophocles, the language of the *Rhesus* is more akin to Aeschylus than to Euripides, and that the resemblance to Sophocles is slight. He is well aware of the pitfalls which lie in the way of an accurate estimate, but does not always avoid them. Who can say, for example, whether the employment of ἀγός, βρίζειν, ἱππηλάτης, and κότος, is in each case to be considered as a reminiscence of Aeschylus, when the author may just as well, if not more probably, have derived the words from his acquaintance with Homer? Among the points of syntax enumerated by Rolfe is a statement that in ναὺς ἐπ' Ἀργείων (155, etc.), εὐνὰς πρὸς Ἑκτορος (660), the position of the preposition is at variance with Euripidean usage, although exactly the same thing is found in *Tro.* 954, *Or.* 94. This particular arrangement is common to all three tragedians: Aesch. *Theb.* 168, *Prom.* 653, Jebb on *O.C.* 84. Not much can be made of the fact that there are only three cases of ordinary anastrophe in the *Rhesus* (72, 397, and 930) as against eight in the *Alcestis* and 13 in the *Cyclops*. In another point of syntax, the employment of πρίν with the indicative mood, the *Rhesus* with two examples comes nearer to Euripides, who has five, than to Aeschylus or Sophocles who have one each (Goodwin, § 633). Rolfe's main contention, that the language of the *Rhesus* is Aeschylean rather than Euripidean, is founded on a curious oversight. He professes to formulate the results of a series of statistical tables which he derived in part from Hagenbach and Eysert, and in part compiled himself, relating to the language of the *Rhesus*, as compared with Aeschylus, Sophocles, and Euripides. Of these tables, Table IV. contains 21 peculiarities common to Aeschylus and the *Rhesus*; V., 14 common to Aeschylus, Sophocles, and the *Rhesus*;

VI., 67 common to Aeschylus, Euripides, and the *Rhesus*; VII., 18 common to Sophocles and the *Rhesus*; and VIII., 67 common to Euripides and the *Rhesus*. These figures, added together, so as to show the reciprocal similarities and dissimilarities, appear to indicate that Sophocles is much more remote from the *Rhesus* than the other two, and that Aeschylus is relatively nearer to it than Euripides. But the whole structure falls to the ground when we observe that there is no table containing the peculiarities common to Sophocles, Euripides, and the *Rhesus*; for it is certain that if such a one had been included¹ the suggested affinity with Aeschylus would have entirely disappeared. The results exhibited in Rolfe's Tables IV., VII., and VIII. are similar to those which I obtained by a less exact method, *i.e.* by a special perusal of the *Rhesus* made in order to test all the more noteworthy words and phrases for the purpose in hand.² Although they do not lead to a positive conclusion, they contain certain features of interest which deserve a brief summary.

If the general complexion of the style is unlike Euripides, nevertheless in points of detail it approximates more closely to him than to Sophocles or Aeschylus. While the choice of vocabulary is largely determined by subject-matter, the use by Euripides and the author of the *Rhesus* of such words as ἀγαμαι, φαῦλος, τρίβων, κομψός, σαθρός, παραιτεῖσθαι, πλημμελής, ἀκριβῶς, all of which are avoided by Aeschylus and Sophocles,³ is significant of the progress

¹ I found 18 instances belonging to this category under the letter α alone. Professor Rolfe has most courteously informed me that he is now aware of this omission.

² After the elimination of a fair proportion of the doubtful cases, my figures showed 90 approximations to Euripides, as compared with 30 to Sophocles and 25 to Aeschylus. I have incorporated a few additional examples from Rolfe.

³ φαῦλος, though Euripidean by preponderance, just occurs in Aeschylus and Sophocles. It may here be observed that the non-Euripidean quality of the style is largely due to the absence from the *Rhesus* of much of the characteristic vocabulary. This would, I believe, be a fruitful field for investigation. From a casual inspection of the letter α I note the following, taken almost

of the tragic speech towards Atticism. But the influence of Euripides is more conspicuous in the coincidences of phraseology which are so numerous that only some of the most striking instances can be mentioned. The metaphorical use of *φέρεσθαι* to convey the agitation of emotion (15) occurs in Eur. *Ion* 1065, *Hel.* 1642. *κάλλιστον οἴκοις κτήμα* (190: cf. 620) is precisely parallel to Eur. *Phoen.* 88 *ὁ κλεινὸν οἴκοις . . . θάλος*. Compare also *πάντ' ἂν φοβηθεῖς ἴσθι*, *δαιμαίνων τότε* (80) with *Hipp.* 519 *πάντ' ἂν φοβηθεῖς ἴσθι*, *δαιμαίνεις δέ τί;* *Rhes.* 122 *πεπύργωται θράσει* with *Or.* 1568; *οὐκ ἄλλως λέγω* (271) with *Hec.* 302, etc. *Rhes.* 274 *πρὸ χειρῶν βαστάζειν* with *I.A.* 35. *Rhes.* 278 *ποίας πατρώας γῆς ἐρηνώσας πέδον;* with *Andr.* 314 *τόδ' ἐκλιποῦς ἐρηνώσεις πέδον*. *Rhes.* 315 *ὅς οὔτε φεύγων . . . ἐκφυγεῖν δυνήσεται* with *Phoen.* 1216. *Rhes.* 370 with *Alc.* 498 *ζάχρυσος πέλτη* (*Θρηκία*). *Rhes.* 467 with *I.A.* 1172 *διὰ μακρὰς ἀπουσίας*. *Rhes.* 770 *ἀφθόνῳ χειρὶ* with *Med.* 612. *Rhes.* 870 with *Hec.* 278 *τῶν τεθνηκότων ἄλς*. I call particular attention to *Rhes.* 656 *ἦκω δ' ἀκούσας οὐ τορῶς, φήμῃ δέ τις | φύλαξιν ἐμπέμπωκεν*, where rhythm and arrangement combine to recall the phraseology of *Hecid.* 494 *κάμοι λέγει μὲν οὐ σαφῶς, λέγει δέ πως*, and *Phoen.* 161 *ὁρῶ δῆτ' οὐ σαφῶς, ὁρῶ δέ πως*. The iteration may be unconscious, but is surely not accidental. If Euripides did not write the *Rhesus*, then either he copied it or its author copied him. It is unnecessary to discuss which is the more probable of these alternatives. We find similar but much less frequent association with Sophocles both in vocabulary (*ἀγχιτέρμων*, *δεννάζειν*, *εἰσπαίειν*, *κακαιοδρία*, *κρότημα*, *κωδωνόκροτος*, *ὀλοφύρεσθαι*, *ὑπασπίδιος*) and in phraseology (*σαλεῖναι πόλιν*, 249, *O.T.* 23; *βίον ἐπαίτεῖν*, 715, *O.C.* 1364; *ὀφειλέτης* with following infinitive, 965; cf. *Alc.* 590). The most significant coincidences are the metaphorical use of *φυτεύειν* (884), a verb frequently employed by Euripides, but always in the literal sense; the echoes in 201 (*ἐλθὼν ἐς δόμους ἐφέστιος*: cf. *Trach.* 262) and 866 (*οὐκ οἶδα τοὺς*

at random: *ἀδικία*, *ἀδόκητος*, *ἀμαθής*, *ἀναφέρειν*, *ἀνέχειν*, *ἀνομία*, *ἀποδιδοῖναι*, *ἀπορία*, *ἀρετή*, *ἀσυνετος*.

σοὺς . . . : cf. *El.* 1110, *Alc.* 792, fr. 165); and the appearance of *πρὸς* adverb at the end of a line but before the adjective which it qualifies (756). The chief resemblance to Aeschylus is to be found in the employment of elaborate compounds or rare words whether such are actually common to both texts (*ἀδείμαντος*, *δυσήλιος*, *δυσοίξιν*, *ἐκτυφλοῦν*, *ιά*, *νυκτηγορεῖν*, *σύρδην*) or not (*κρυσταλλόπηκτος*: *κρυσταλλοπήξ*; *καρανιστής*: *καρανιστήρ*; *πολίохος*: *πολιούχος*).¹ Here and there are clear echoes of phraseology: 290 *ρέων* as compared with *Theb.* 80, 54 *αἰρεσθαι φυγῇν* with *Pers.* 484. The imagery of 183, 446 may be traced to *Theb.* 401.

The influence of Homer is unmistakable, even on a casual inspection. Particular passages copied from K are 301 ff. from K 437 ff., 622 f. from K 479 ff., and 780 ff. developed from the hint given by K 496. *διόπτῃς* (234) was probably suggested by K 562 *τὸν ῥα διοπτῆρα στρατοῦ ἐμμεναι ἡμετέροιο*, and 532 by K 159 *ἔγρεο Τυδεὸς υἱέ· τί πάννυχον ὕπνον ἄωταις*; The most striking Homericisms are the words *θυσσόκοῦς*, *εὐσελμος*, *ὑπομένειν* (= 'to withstand'), *μηνῖειν*, *μέρμερος*, *δέχθαι*, *μεμβλακότων*, *κοῖτος*, *τολυπεύσας*, *νεῖρα*, *πρηνής*, and the phrases *ἐπιθρῶσκειν νεῶν*, *σχέσθαι χέρα*, *ἄδην ἐλαύνειν*, *κορύσσειν ἀλκῆς*. Add that the periphrastic use of *κεφαλῇ* (226, 903) occurs nowhere else in tragedy. There is more interest in certain syntactical peculiarities which should, I believe, be referred to here. In 865 *χρόνον* used adverbially (= *aliquamdiu*) finds its best parallel in ζ 295 *ἐνθα καθεζόμενος μῆναι χρόνον*. A similar remark applies to the temporal use of *ἀνὰ* in 42, and perhaps to the jussive optative in 4 (Goodw. § 725). In 469 *ἐπεὶ ἂν* is Homeric (*Z* 412). I cannot understand the acceptance of *ἐπειδάν*. Not only is a full-stop required after *λέγω* to complete the reply to the chorus (455 ff.), but the presence of *δέ* is essential to balance the preceding *μέν* and to mark the transition to a new point. I can find

¹ The remark is applicable to many of the ἄπαξ εἰρημένα, which do not directly suggest Aeschylus: *ἀριστότοκος*, *κακόγαμβρος*, *καλλιγέφυρος*, *καρποποιός*, *ῥακόδυτος*, *φυλλόστρωτος*, *χρυσόβωλος*, *ψαφαρόχρους*, etc.

no evidence to determine the quantity of the last syllable of *ἐπειδάν*, although a similar question arises in Aesch. *Theb.* 721. I should refer to the same source the use of *ὥστε* (*as*) with a finite verb (cf. *Monro, H.G.*², § 285, 3a), although it is not so unexampled as Tyrrell on *Bacch.* 1066 supposed: *Soph. fr.* 474, 3 n. In 720 Paley stands alone in refusing to admit that *ῥλοῖτο* = *εἶθ' ὥλετο*; but it is incredible that *ἔχνος βαλεῖν* refers to a permanent settlement in Phrygia. On the other hand it is impossible to treat this passage like *Hipp.* 406, *Hcl.* 1215, where *ῥλοῖτο* (= 'a curse on . . .') is illogically employed without a time-reference. Here the presence of *πρὶν* establishes the connexion with the past, and the optative is used as occasionally in Homer (*N* 826, σ 79). Lastly, in 864 the appearance of the subjunctive after a verb of fearing in relation to a past event (*δέδοικα . . . μὴ καὶ Δόλωνα συντυχῶν κατακτάνῃ*) is unexampled in Attic, and has caused Wecklein rashly to accept Matthiae's *κατέκτανεν*. But not only are similar examples of the subjunctive found in Homer (*Monro, H.G.*², § 358), but in a passage nearly corresponding to this, which may well have been in the writer's mind, Nestor thus expresses his fear for the fate of Odysseus and Diomedes: *ἀλλ' αἰνῶς δέδοικα κατὰ φρένα, μὴ τι πάθωσιν | Ἀργείων οἱ ἄριστοι ὑπὸ Τρώων ὄρυμαρδοῦ*.

The diction thus appears to be a conglomerate of divers constituents, some of which (e.g. *προταυνί*, *Ἐκτόρειά χεῖρ*, *μυχθισμὸς νεκρῶν*, *ἐντάσσειν*, *εὐσπλαγχνία*, *μηνάς*, *ἄησις*, *κατάστασις νυκτός*, *κλάζειν σιδήρου*) we are unable to trace to their source. It may, of course, be argued that stylistic tests are a slippery handhold, and that a similar case might be manufactured for other plays that are unquestionably genuine. It cannot be denied that Eysert had some justification for saying that the authorship of Euripides could not be disproved by arguments based on language. But I am not so sure that this would be true if we possessed a *Lexicon* of Euripides as complete as those of Aeschylus and Sophocles which were compiled by Dindorf and Ellendt. I have made an attempt on a small

scale to provide a standard of Euripidean diction which could be made applicable to the *Rhesus* by selecting an equivalent number of lines from the *Alcestis*, the total to comprise the same number of iambic, anapaestic, and lyric verses as are contained in the disputed play. The *Alcestis* was chosen (1) because of its date, and (2) to meet the pro-satyrical argument; and it will be admitted that it affords a fair field of comparison. With some help from my pupils, I made a verbal index of the *Rhesus* and the parallel extracts of the *Alcestis* in order to compare their vocabularies. The statistics may perhaps be regarded on general grounds as inconclusive, because, in order to fix securely the Euripidean norm, it would be desirable to ascertain whether the *Alcestis* is actually characteristic throughout, however small the doubt in particular cases. There are however certain facts which emerge and deserve attention. It very soon becomes evident that a large part of the vocabulary is irrelevant to the investigation, being determined by the choice of subject-matter; so that while in the *Alcestis* words like 'husband,' 'wife,' 'house,' 'marriage,' 'children,' are prominent, in the *Rhesus* they yield to 'army,' 'camp,' 'enemy,' 'ships,' 'horses.' Even so it may surprise us that *γυνή* (43 times in *Alcestis*) does not occur in the *Rhesus* alone among the extant plays attributed to Euripides. What we desire chiefly to know is how the two plays compare in regard to neutral words which occur anywhere, and especially, owing to their wider field, in regard to conjunctions, particles, and pronouns. Starting with the impression that the style of the *Rhesus* was less flexible and pointed than the normal Euripidean, I expected to find in it a less frequent occurrence of these words. On the whole the anticipation was realised, though not altogether as I expected. Thus a comparison of the use of the prepositions which I thought might be instructive proved absolutely futile. But the examination of 33 small words, the article, the pronouns *ὅς*, *ἐγώ*, *σύ*, *ἐμός*, *σός*, *αὐτός*, *ὅδε*, *οὗτος*, *ἐκεῖνος* (*κεῖνος*), the negative *μή*, the adverbs, conjunctions, and particles *ἀν*,

τοι, τε, καί, δέ, γε, μέν, ἔτι, εἰ, οὖν, ἄρα (ἄρα), δὴ, δῆτα, ἀλλά, ὥς, πῶς, ἦ, ἦ, γάρ, ὦ, ἦδη—purposely omitting words with few occurrences—yielded in the *Rhesus* 1,263 examples as against 1,620 in the *Alcestis*, or a proportion of very nearly 3 : 4. Moreover, with two exceptions, δέ (179 : 159) and ὥς (31 : 25), in every single case the numbers in the *Alcestis* were larger. Those which impressed me most were ἄν (28 : 57), ὅς (31 : 60), ἐγώ (74 : 145), γε (17 : 40), ἔτι (1 : 23), ἐκείνος (2 : 11), δὴ and δῆτα (15 : 30). Now I do not claim that all this dissection of phraseology is decisive, but I do say that there is a strong case against Euripides to go to the jury, and if they should decide in his favour, I should be ready to argue that their verdict was against the weight of evidence. But that is not all, for I hope to show that the case rests upon broader grounds.

Since those who defend the genuineness of the *Rhesus* all claim it as an early play, it may be added that an early date is rendered improbable by the introduction of the *deus ex machina*,¹ and the division of single verses between different speakers (ἀντιλαβή) in anapaestic and trochaic systems, though not in iambic trimeters. There is, moreover, one stylistic peculiarity, which, though it has not, so far as I am aware, been noticed, is of some importance as bearing on the capacity of the author—I mean his marked tendency to repeat his own phrases. I do not refer to the careless repetition of an unstressed word within a few lines of its first occurrence,² but to the deliberate use on a later occasion of a word or combination of words previously approved. Such are the repetitions of ἔδρα βλεφάρων (ὄμματος), ἐκ νυκτῶν, πολύφωνος χεῖρ, ὕστερον βοηδρομεῖν, δις τόσος, φθόνον εἰργεῖν, ὄχημα πωλικόν, πωλοδαμνεῖν, ὀδυνή τείρει, διοίσει, πυρὰ αἶθειν, αἶρεσθαι φυγὴν, ἰέναι πόδα, δυσοίξιν, ὑπερβαλὼν, στρατόν (λόχους), δειννά-

ζειν, εὔδειν κόπῳ (ἐκ κόπων), εἰς αὔριον, κοιμᾶν, and others (190 κάλλιστον οἴκοις κτήμα : cf. 620. 18 φυλακὰς προλιπὼν κινεῖς στρατιάν : cf. 37). The words κατόπτῃς, κατάσκοπος, κλώπες, ναύσταθμα, κέλσαι, στείχειν (13 : 5 *Alc.*), and the phrases ὕστερον μολεῖν (μολεῖν alone 28 : 9 *Alc.*), κατὰ στόμα, Ἀργείων στρατόν, and ναὺς ἐπ' Ἀργείων, are all repeated several times.³ ναὺς ἐπ' Ἀργείων occurs six times in the same place in the verse, in which also γῆν ἐπ' Ἀργείων and ναύσταθμ' Ἀργείων appear. It is worth notice that ναὺς ἐπ' Ἀργείων is used by Euripides in *Tro.* 954. The word ὄρφη, not used by Aeschylus and Sophocles, occurs at last six times in eighteen plays of Euripides, and seven times in the *Rhesus* alone. These repetitions, the most important of which has still to be mentioned, are not the laxities permitted to itself by conscious power, but betray the narrow resources of a sterile talent. In 447 ff. *Rhesus* vaingloriously boasts that a single day will suffice for him to sack the towers, to fall upon the shipyards and to destroy the Greeks; and the chorus, after a somewhat futile prayer—itself repeated from 342 f.—that divine jealousy may not attend his speech, flatter him by saying that neither Achilles nor Ajax, though reputed the mightiest of the Greeks (496 f.), can withstand his blade. At 600 ff. we read with amazement the declaration of the Greek patroness Athena, accepting the boasts of *Rhesus* at their face value, by the admission that if *Rhesus* lives through the night neither Achilles nor Ajax will prevent him from sacking the shipyards, leveling the walls, and making a broad path through the entrance with his blade (ναύσταθμα, πέρσαι, and λόγχη repeated). After this glaring ineptitude we are not

³ Of course some allowance must be made for the fact that words appropriate to the subject-matter are apt to be repeated (cf. the recurrence in the *Ion* of the rare word ἀντίπηξ); but that principle is insufficient to account for the repetitions of the *Rhesus*. A comparison of the occurrences of certain common military words in the *Rhesus* and in Aesch. *Theb.*, δῖαμα Ἄρεος μεστών, as Aristophanes calls it, yields the following results : στρατός and its derivatives, 65 *Rhes.*, 14 *Theb.*; δορυ, 22 *Rhes.*, 13 *Theb.*; πολέμιος, 24 *Rhes.*, 8 *Theb.*

¹ See Decharme, *Euripides*, tr. Loeb, pp. 270, 273. I do not mention the employment of four actors or the anapaestic opening, since the fact in the first case and the significance of the second are disputed.

² This tendency was illustrated by Jebb on *O.C.* 554. See also my n. on *Eur. Hel.* 674.

much disturbed by the inconsistency of the Muse, who first of all curses Diomedes and Odysseus for taking the life of her son (906 ff.), but subsequently declares that Odysseus and Diomedes had nothing to do with the murder, whereupon she is immediately contradicted by Hector's assertion that it was palpably due to the wiles of Odysseus.

Apart from verbal incongruities, the structure of the play shows signs of the same clumsiness. Hector, at first rash and impulsive, yields tamely to the remonstrance of Aeneas directly it is pressed home. Similarly, his refusal to welcome Rhesus disappears no less suddenly before the advice of the chorus. 'Very well,' says Hector, 'we will treat him as a guest, but he must not be our ally.' The chorus and the messenger each speak a single line of protest. Hector commends them, and adds: 'Rhesus our ally will soon be here!' Can anything be more fatuous? But it is equally important to observe that neither Hector's impulsiveness nor his readiness to recant has any dramatic value, either as bearing on the development of the plot or as exhibiting his character in relation to the action. Again, the episode of Dolon's appearance and his request to be rewarded with Achilles' horses in the event of success are entirely without significance in the sequel. Even the preposterous vauntings of Rhesus do not seem to have any obvious connexion with his untimely death. Not only do the circumstances of the raid upon the Thracian camp fail to arouse the emotions appropriate to tragedy; but Athena's interference is that of a mischievous stage puppet, whose proceedings merely provoke our incredulity.

The curious thing about the *Rhesus* is that, when all this has been said, the play is not nearly so bad as it ought to be. For that result we have chiefly to thank the story, which is full of movement and comprises stirring events.¹ Nevertheless its adaptation to the stage is skilfully arranged, and the literary workmanship by no means contemptible.

¹ E.g. the opening scene and that in which Odysseus and Diomedes escape from the guards are well-contrived and impressive.

The lyrics have been deservedly praised by Prof. Murray, and some of the *ῥήσεις* are extremely effective, especially the speeches of Hector and Rhesus at 392, 422, and of the charioteer at 736. Lastly the scene between Hector and the charioteer, though severely criticised by Valckenaer, seems to me to be admirable; and here at any rate the tragic Hector is not altogether unworthy of his epic prototype.

The effect of the external evidence remains to be stated. The play was undoubtedly attributed to Euripides in the MSS. accessible to the Alexandrian scholars at the time when Aristophanes prepared his edition. Its authenticity was further supported by the registration of the *Rhesus* of Euripides in the didascalie and the astronomical references in the text (528 ff.). Nevertheless, there were some who doubted its genuineness on the ground that it rather bore the impression of Sophoclean authorship. The balance of evidence appeared to Aristophanes—for the decision must ultimately be traced to his judgment—to incline in favour of Euripides. But he gives us the additional information that two 'prologues'—to use the word in its narrowest sense—were extant. For one of these he appeals to the authority of Dicaearchos,² who, in his *ὑποθέσεις τῶν Εὐριπίδου καὶ Σοφοκλέους μύθων* quoted the opening line, and perhaps others. The second prologue, of which eleven lines are preserved, was actually found in some of the MSS., but was considered commonplace and unworthy of Euripides, and as possibly the composition of some of the actors.

It is certain that Euripides wrote a *Rhesus*, but not so certain that our play was recognised as his work by the Peripatetic school. The didascalie could scarcely prove so much as this, and the reference to Dicaearchus only establishes that he quoted from Euripides a line which is not in our text. On the other hand, Aristophanes suppressed a prologue which he believed to

² Δικαίᾱρχος is Nauck's certain emendation of δικάϊαν, being clearly indicated by the words ἐκτιθεῖς τὴν ὑπόθεσιν. It should be remembered that the aim of Dicaearchus was not critical.

be spurious, and expressed an opinion that the original text might have been corrupted by the actors. On the basis of these facts it might be suggested that the *Rhesus* of Euripides was revived for performance in the fourth century, for which purpose it was extensively recast, and that by compression, substitution, and omission, including the omission of a genuine prologue and the tentative substitution of a new one, it was adapted for the stage in a form considered more suitable by the actors.¹ Can such a view be recommended? I think not, partly because there is no evidence elsewhere that the ancient texts suffered such drastic mutilations, but chiefly because the complete removal of the chief Euripidean characteristics is almost inconceivable.

The judgment of the ancient critics who detected a similarity to the works of Sophocles is interesting. No one has ventured to attribute the play to him, but the remark should not be scouted as merely perverse. Wilamowitz² found in the characterisation, diction and metre evidence of a deliberate reversion to Sophoclean methods, in reaction from the prevalent imitation of Euripides.³ I suggest that it is possible to fix the *Σοφοκλείος χαρακτήρ* somewhat more precisely. It is not necessary to restrict *χαρακτήρ* to its rhetorical sense; for, as applied to Sophocles, it includes all the qualities appertaining to a dramatic poet. Now, the *Rhesus* is remarkable as being the only extant tragedy directly dependent upon Homer, which we are able to compare in detail with its source. Subject to the consideration that the

drama describes from the Trojan point of view what the epic narrates from the Greek, the stories of Dolon and Rhesus are reproduced substantially in their original form. There are also a number of verbal echoes and imitations of Homer, some of which have already been enumerated. Now is not all this exactly what we should expect from Sophocles? 'Sophocles,' says the speaker in Athenaeus,⁴ 'delighted in the epic Cycle to such an extent that throughout the whole of a play he would follow closely the epic narrative.' So the author of the *Life*:⁵ 'His plots follow in the tracks of Homer, and in several of his plays he produces an exact copy of the *Odyssey*.' But Sophocles also recalled Homer by his delineation of character, and by the artistic expression of his thought.⁶ Aristotle compared the art of Sophocles with that of Homer; and Polemo the Academic declared that Homer was an epic Sophocles, Sophocles a tragic Homer.⁷ The Homeric proclivities of Sophocles would be clearer to us, if we possessed more of the plays belonging to the Trojan cycle—e.g., the *Ἑλένης ἀπαίτησις*, the *Polyxena*, the *Nausicaa*, and the *Ὀδυσσεὺς ἀκανθοπλήξ*; clearer still, if with them had been preserved the *Cyclic Cypria* and *Nosti*. It has been well said of Sophocles by Mr. J. T. Sheppard:⁸ 'To Sophocles the story is the thing. . . . In that respect he is like Homer: this, not simply his vocabulary and syntax, makes him "the most Homeric" of the Attic poets. . . . His business was to make the epic stories live in a new form, dramatic instead of narrative: he had to tell the tale no longer as a story-teller, who narrates, but, as a dramatist, through the speeches and the actions of the characters themselves.' It was owing to considerations such as these, I believe, that the ancient critics were reminded of Sophocles by the *Rhesus*.

The conclusion I have reached in the case of the *Rhesus* is that, whereas

¹ Some such conclusion is adopted by Dieterich in Pauly-Wissowa, VI. 1265.

² *Einleitung in die gr. Tragödie*, p. 41. Dieterich also says that in style and metre the imitation of Sophocles is self-evident. It is a pity that these critics were not more explicit.

³ Wilamowitz had forestalled Murray's criticism that there is no evidence of such a tendency in the scanty fragments which survive from the fourth-century drama. But it is curious that he should have selected as its representative the very man—Theodectes—whom Murray rejects as unsuitable. I note in passing that two of the words common to Sophocles and the *Rhesus* occur together in Theodect. fr. 17.

⁴ 277e.

⁵ *Ib.* 13.

⁷ Arist. *poet.* 3. 1448a 26; Diog. L. 4. 20; Suid. s.v. Πολύμων.

⁸ *Greek Tragedy*, pp. 89 f.

⁶ *Vit. Soph.* 12.

the internal evidence makes against the authorship of Euripides, the external is inconclusive. It amounts to no more than this, that the best of the ancient critics acquiesced in the appropriation. If an enquiry is raised how our *Rhesus* came to be attributed to Euripides at so early a date, no answer can be given. We might think of the younger Euripides, were it not that the notice in Suidas, which is the sole evidence of his dramatic activity, is extremely suspicious. But it is unnecessary to seek for a particular connexion. The case of the *Rhesus* does not stand alone: there were several other plays, current under the names of one or other of the great tragedians, about the acceptance or rejection of which Aristophanes was required to decide. If he was wrong

in accepting the *Rhesus*,¹ he was probably right in rejecting the tetralogy *Tennes*, *Rhadamanthys*, *Pirithous*, and satyric *Sisyphus*, which modern criticism agrees in assigning to Critias. This is a particularly interesting parallel, because, besides the spurious *Sisyphus*, there had undoubtedly existed a play of this name, written by Euripides, which was unknown to the Alexandrians.² The same thing happened with Aeschylus and Sophocles. Seven plays were rejected from the Sophoclean canon, and the Medicean catalogue of the plays of Aeschylus retains in conjunction the *Αἰτναῖαι* and the *Αἰτναῖαι νόθοι*.

A. C. PEARSON.

¹ On the critical history of the *Rhesus*, see Wilamowitz, *de Rhesi scholiis*, Greifswald, 1877.
² Aelian *var. hist.* 2. 8.

THE TECHNIQUE OF VIRGIL'S VERSE.

In the *Class. Rev.*, February-March, 1920, some illustrations were given of a species of Alliteration employed by Virgil. Using this in conjunction with Assonance, he elaborates the tendency to repetition of letters and sounds, which appears spasmodically in all kinds of composition, into a nicely-adjusted method, which enhances the beauty of his varied rhythms.

Also, as in 'Lethaei f-l-uminis undam | securos latices, et longa ob-l-ivia potant'; or, 'intus ac(qu)ae d-ulces vivoque se-d-ilia sac-so (saxo), | Nympharum d-omus,' the letter is carried on by what may be termed *Echo*.

Alliterations ('sedilia saxo') are introduced within an interwoven scheme; as V. 613, 'at p-ro-cul in sola secretae T-ro-ades acta | amissum Anchisen flebant, cunctaeque p-ro-fundum | pontum aspectabant.'¹ Cf. II. 31, 'pars st-up-et inn-up-tae donum ec-sitiale M-in-ervae, et molem mirantur ec-(qu)i.'

A successive alliteration ('acta amissum Anchisen') is occasionally employed when there is a certain stress,²

as IX. 30, 'ceus s-eptem s-urgens s-edatis amnibus altus | Ganges'; or where there is a real emphasis, as XII. 600, 'se causam clamat, crimenque, caputque malorum. Another example, 'sola mihi tales casus Cassandra cane-bat,' may serve to introduce some illustrations of a point not touched upon in the former article. Virgil arranges his alliterations within the rhythmical paragraph in accordance with the natural stress in recitation. Thus, 'et molem mirantur equi'; or, 'hic primum fortuna fidem mutata novavit'; or, 'horrendum et dictu video mirabile monstrum; | nam quae prima solo raptis radicibus arbor | vellitur, huic atro liquuntur sanguine guttae, | et terram tabo maculant.' By the nature of the case, Proper Names are usually emphatic; and they are taken up³ either by alliteration, as 'pinguis ubi et placabilis ara Palici'; or by assonance, as 'an-te feras solitus terrere fugaces | Asc-an-ius, fortemque m-an-u fudisse Num-an-um.' So also, 'exin Gorgoneis Allecto infecta venenis; apparet Camarina procul campique Geloi; Erycis tibi terga remitto; nomen dixere priores

¹ Cf. *Aen.* I. 24, 'pr-ima quod ad T-ro-iam p-ro caris,' etc.; and II. 1, 2, 'T-ro-iae qui primus ab oris Italiam, fato p-ro-fugus,' etc.

² Cf. V. 861, 'se sustulit ales ad auras'; II. 84; V. 417 'idque pio sedet Aeneae, probet auctor Acestes, | aequemus pugnās.'

³ Except when resumptive, and equivalent merely to a pronoun. Cf. 'misit Sa-turn-ia Iuno | audacem ad Turn-um' at the beginning of Book X. with II. 4 and 6.

Ortygiam; *casta licet patruī servet Proserpina limen*; *nec dubiis ea signa dedit Tritonia monstribus*.¹ In the specially emphatic instance, '*sola mihi tales casus Cassandra canebat*,' both methods are combined. Some further examples of Virgil's treatment of proper names may be found interesting:

- (a) *h-ac-tenus, Ac-ca* soror, potui; nunc volnus *ac-erbum* conficit.
 (b) saepius *Andromache ferre in-comitata* solebat.
 (c) *Al-ban*ique patres atque *al-tae* moenia *Romae* (cf. *Aen.* VII. 83).
 (d) idque audire *s-at* est, iamdudum *sum-it-e* poenas;
 hoc *Il-thacus* vel-*it*, et magno *mercentur* *At-ridae*.
 (e) *tibi* quem promitti saepius *audis*
 Augustus Caesar, divi *genus*; *aurea* condet saecula.
 (f) *v-ic-torem* *Buten* immani corpore qui se *Bebr-yc-ia* veniens *Am-yc-eli* de gente ferebat.
 (g) adveniet iustum pugnae, ne *arcessite*, tempus
 cum fera *Carthago* Romanis *arcibus* olim exitium magnum atque *Alpes* immittet apertas.
 (h) praecipitemque *Daren* *ardens* agit aequore toto,
 nunc dextra *i-ngeminans i-ctus*, nunc *i-lle* sinistra.¹
 (i) hic *Dard-an* io *An-chisae*
 armiger an-te fuit, *fidusque* ad limina *custos*.²
 (j) bellumne *inferre* paratis,
 et patrio *Harpyias insontes* pellere regno?

The echo of the letter in '*paratis, patrio, Harpyias, pellere*,' will be noted as similar to that in '*Buten, Bebrycia ferebat*,' above. Except for thus carrying on a Proper Name (or for certain effects exemplified in the previous article), Virgil seldom uses the *b*-sound in alliterations. Cf. VI. 1 ff. '*classique immittit habenas | et tandem Euboicis Cumarum adlabitur oris; | obvertunt pelago proras. Ib. 86, 7; V. 306 (bina dabo . . . bipennem).*'

¹ A successive alliteration, '*ardens agit aequore toto*,' aids the emphasis. The assonances, '*ingeminans . . . sinistra*,' are as in VI. 10 f., quoted in the next note.

² The pause in the grammatical structure is bridged by alliteration ('*fuit, fidusque*'), cf. in example (n), below, '*Ilionei monitu, et multum*,' etc. Otherwise this is effected by assonance, as *Aen.* I. 13, '*Car-tha-go, Italia* contra,' etc., VI. 10, '*secreta Sibyllae, | an-trum imm-an-e* petit; magnam cui mentem *an-imumque* | Delius inspirat.' Cf. the arrangement of V. 831, 2; and II. 200, 1 ('*vos . . . vos, sc-op-ulos . . . Cycl-op-ia*').

- (k) virginis os habitumque gerens et virginis *arma*
 Spartanae vel qualis equos *Threissa* fatigat *Harpalyce*.
 (l) cedet *Iulus* agris, nec post arma *ulla* rebelles.³
 (m) subnectit *fibula* vestem,
 nec non et *Phrygii* comites et laetus *Iulus*.
 (n) *il-lam i-ncendentem luctus I-daeus* et *Actor* *Il-ionei* monitu, et *m-ul-tum* lacrimantis *I-ul-i*.
 (o) quam *Iuno* fertur terram magis omnibus *unam*.
 (p) *Iupiter*, inque omen *Iuturnae* occurrere possit.
 (q) huc, pater, o *Lenae*; tuis hic omnia *plena*.
 (r) nos abiisse rati, et *vento* petiisse *Mycenas*,
 (s) et nunc quod patrias *vento* petiere *Mycenas*, *ar-ma* deosque *p-ar-ant* comites, *pelagoque* *remen-so*
 improvisi aderunt.⁴
 (t) custodes lecti *Phoen-ix* et dirus *Ul-ix-es*.
 (u) *ger-man-us* habebat
 Pygmaëon, scelere *an-te alios* im-man-ior omnes.
 (v) templum *Si-do-nia Di-do*
 condebant do-nis opulentum et numine *di-vae*.
 (w) talibus *in-sidiis*, periurique arte *S-in-onis*, *credita res*, captique, etc.
 (x) *De-iphobum* vidit, lacerum *cru-de-liter* ora.
 (y) tum facta *sil-en-tia* linguis,
 et *V-en-ulus* dicto *par-en-s* ita farier in-fit.⁵
 (z) *an-te* diem clauso componat *Ves-per* *Olympo*,
 nos *Troia an-tiqua*, si *ves-tras* forte per aures, etc.

Besides its aesthetic interest, the study of the method employed in the structure of his verse throws light on a great variety of points connected with Virgil's art. One of these occurs in the animated description of the boxing-match in the Fifth Book. The retired Sicilian champion, Entellus, comes out to meet the Trojan boxer Dares. When the preliminaries, including a dispute concerning the gloves to be used, are settled, the contest begins. In the lines describing the first bout, when the men

³ Cf. II. 44, '*aut ul-la putatis | dona carere dolis Danaum? sic notus Ul-ixes?*' X. 333, '*non ul-lum dextera frustra | torserit in Rut-ul-os.*'

⁴ '*Re-menso*' takes up '*re-petant, re-ducant*,' which precede. The passage continues (II. 182): '*im-p(ro)visi aderunt, ita digerit omina Cal-chas. | hanc p(ro) P-alladio moniti, p(ro) numine laeso, | ef-figiem statuere, n-ef-as quae triste paret.*'

⁵ Cf. II. 105, '*tum vero ar-demus scit-ar-iet c(qu)arerere causas; | ign-ar-i scelerum tantorum, ar-tisque Pelasgae; | prosequitur pavitans, et ficto pectore fatur*'; where '*tantorum . . . pavitans*' balance in sound, as '*linguis . . . in-fit*' do here.

face each other and spar for an opening (ll. 426-432), the unusual scansion *genua labant* occurs. No one accustomed to study Virgil's work at all carefully will suppose it done at random. The sparing and appropriate employment, for instance, of archaistic forms and expressions is very noticeable. Thus, II. 54, 'insonuere *cavae* gemitumque dedere *cavernae*.' Again, in an oracular utterance (VII. 70), 'et summa *dominariae* arce.'¹ So in VI. 747, 'aetherium sensum atque *aurai* simplicis ignem'; in lines reminiscent of the speculations of the old Ionian nature-philosophies. Again, in III. 549 a tetrasyllabic ending with a word other than a proper name occurs. Here the line, 'cornua velatarum obvertimus antennarum,' suggests the effort of the crew, and the groaning of the tackle, as the yards are braced round when the ship goes about on a new tack. If now we compare with the lines from the Fifth Book those in the *Georgics* which follow after the signs of rough weather described in I. 388 ff., 'tum cornix plena plu(v)iam (v)ocat improba (v)oce, | et sola in sicca secum spatiat harena; | ne nocturna quidem car-pen-tes pen-sa p-uellae | ne-scivere hiemem,' it will be seen that there too an unusual scansion, *tenuia*, occurs:

nam neque tum stellis acies ob-tusa videtur,
nec f-ra-tris ra-diis ob-noxia surgere (L)una;
ten-ua nec (l)anae per cae(l)um ve(l)era ferri;
non te(p)idum ad solem (p)ennas in litore
(p)andunt
dilectae Thetidi alcyones.

Georg. I. 395.

Here '*tenuia*' is so placed as to link the clauses by assonance. Thus '*tenuia . . . pennas*,' balance '*obtusa . . . obnoxia*,' with an effect similar to that in the lines quoted in the last footnote, '*adstat . . . adolet*.' In the same way, '*tepidum*' leads on by sound to the proper name '*Thetidi*.' Cf. I. 30, '*tibi serviat ultima Thule, | te-que sibi generum Te-thys emat omnibus undis*.'

¹ The lines which follow exhibit the linking of the clauses by assonance, and the taking up of the proper name: 'summa domin-ar-ier ar-ce; | praeterea, castis adolet dum alt-ar-ia taedis, ut iuxta genitorem adstat La-vi-nia vi-rgo | vi-sa, nefas! longis comprehendere crinibus ignem.'

Aen. V. 420, 'solve me-tu-s, et tu Troianos exue ces-tu-s.'

Turning now to the passage under discussion, and examining it in the light of the effects which to Virgil's ear were essential to the harmony of his verse, it will be seen that *genua* subserves these as indicated below:

tum satus Anchisa cestus pater ec-stulit aequos,
et paribus palmas amborum inn-ec-suit armis.
constitit in digitos ec-stemplo arr-ec-tus uterque,
brachiaque ad superas interritus ec-stulit auras.
ab-duxere retro longe capita ardua ab i-ctu,
i-mmiscentque manus manibus pugnamque
laccessunt,
i-lle pedum melior motu fretusque i-uenta,
hic membris et mole va-lens, sed tarda trementii
gen-va labant; va-stos quatit aeger anhelitus
artus
multa viri nequidquam in-ter se volnera iactant,
multa cavo la-ter-i in-geminant et pectore vastos
dant sonitus, erratque aures et tempora c-ir-cum
cre-bra ma-nus; cre-pitant duro sub volnere
ma-lae.
Aen. V. 424-436.²

Readers of the former article may have noticed a characteristic Virgilian arrangement of sound in the lines, 'et paribus palmas amborum innexus armis. constitit in digitos extemplo arrectus uterque.' Compare II. 19, 'in-c-ludunt c-ae-c-o lateri penitusque c-avernas | ingentes uterumque armato milite con-plent. est in conspectu Tenedos.' With the effect in the concluding line of those quoted above may be compared V. 124, where the interwoven alliteration is arranged as shown: 'est p-rocul in p-elago s-axum s-puman-tia con-tra | litora quod t-umidis s-ub-mer-sum t-und-itur olim | fluctibus hiberni con-dunt ubi s-idera Co-ri; | t-ranquillo s-ilet immotaque a-ttollitur und-a | c-ampus et a-pricis s-tatio gra-tissima mergis.' The successive alliteration '*aeger anhelitus artus*' is obviously appropriate to the emphasis. Compare ll. 444 ff., where Dares avoids a chopping blow from a right-hand lead, thereby causing his opponent to over-reach and fall heavily: '*i-lle i-ctum venientem a vertice velox | prae-v-ident,*

² With '*membris et mole valens*,' cf. '*et molem mirantur equi*,' quoted above. An intensification of method, suggested by the subject-matter of the passage, is evident. Cf. XII. 700:

c(qu)antus At-thos au-t c(qu)antus Er-ic(yx)
au-t ipse corus-c-is | cum fremit il-ic-ibus
c(qu)antus, g-au-det que nivali | v-er-tic-e, se at-tollens p-at-er A-ppenninus a-d au-ras.

celerique elapsus corpore cessit. | Entellus vires in ventum effudit et ultro | ipse *gra-v-is gra-v-iterque* ad terram pondere vasto | *conc-id-it*; ut *con* (quon)-dam *ca-v-a conc-id-it* aut *Er-ymantho* | aut *Id-a* in magna radicibus *er-uta* pinus. *con-surgunt*¹ studiis,' etc.

The proper names here are seen to be taken up in the manner of which various examples have been given above. Compare:

constitit, et *l-ac-rimans*, 'quis *iam* *l-ocus*,' inquit, 'Ach-ate,
quae regio in terris nostri non *p-l-en-a* *l-laboris*?
en, Pr-iam-us! s-unt hic *et-iam* s-ua *pr-aemia* *l-audi*;
s-unt *l-ac-rimae* rerum *et mentem* *mortalia* tangunt;
s-olve *m-et-us*.' *Aen.* I. 459.²

¹ Compare 'milite *con-plent*. est in *con-spectu* Tenedos,' quoted above.

² Cf. II. 145:
ipse viro *pri-mus* manicas a-tque a-rcta levare
vincla iubet *Pri-am-us*, dictisque ita fatur
am-icis,
quisquis es, *am-issos* hinc *iam* obliviscere Graios.

To an ear taught by Virgil to listen for the harmony of his verse some of the correspondences in sound which he elaborates will often suggest themselves as a rhythmical paragraph approaches its conclusion. In the case of various uncompleted lines which a poet of Virgil's fertility in invention could have found no difficulty in concluding suitably to the sense in many different ways, it is possible to form an idea of what the effect was that he desiderated. On a future occasion it may be possible to consider one or two of these cases in connexion with passages which here and there occur, where a word, obviously not the best (as *parent*, *Aen.* I. 124), is used as a temporary stop-gap from its suitability to the verse: '*v-olgi* quae *v-ox* ut *v-enit* ad aures | obstipuerunt animi gelidusque *per ima cu-currit*, *os-sa* tremor *cu-i* fata *parent*, *qu-em p-os-cat* A-*p-ollo*.' So too IV. 130, 'iubare . . . iuventus.'

C. E. S. HEADLAM.

AN ECHO OF EURIPIDES IN PROPERTIUS.

In his note on Propertius II. xxvi. 2 (*Select Elegies of Propertius* III. xxi. 2) Professor Postgate quotes Euripides, *Iphigenia in Tauris* 255 ἐναλὶα δρόσω in commenting on *Ionio rore*. But there is more in this than a mere verbal parallel. As a matter of fact that elegy contains a whole series of echoes of the passage of Euripides which begins with the line referred to.

The most striking point of resemblance is that the same marine deities are mentioned by both poets. In *I.T.* 270 'one of pious mood' beholds Orestes and Pylades sitting on the shore and prays:

*ὦ ποτ' ἴαται παῖ Λευκοθέας, νεῶν φύλαξ,
δέσποτα Παλαίμων, ἴδωός ἡμῖν γενοῦ,
εἴτ' οὖν ἐπ' ἅκταις θάσσετον Διοσκύρῳ,
ἢ Νηρέως ἀγάλμαθ', ὅς τὸν εὐγενῆ
ἔτικτε πεντήκοντα Νηρηῶν χρόνον.

Compare Propertius, II. 9-10, 13-16:

quae tum ego Neptuno, quae tum cum Castore
fratri,
quaeque tibi excepi, iam dea Leucothoe! . . .
quod si forte tuos uidisset Glaucus ocellos,
esses Ionii facta puella maris,
et tibi ob invidiam Nereides increpitarant,
candida Nesaee, caerulea Cymothoe.

Propertius has added Neptune, as being *potens maris deus*, and has neatly rounded off his description by particularising two of the Nereids. But the Leucothoe, Palaemon, Dioscuri and Nereids of Euripides all appear in Propertius also, for Palaemon-Melicertes may be regarded as the equivalent of Glaucus (they were sometimes identified, as by Nicander, quoted in Athenaeus VII. p. 296).

Besides this coincidence of deities there are several coincidences of words and phrases, which I give in the order of the Greek text:

- 255 ἐναλὶα δρόσω.
2 Ionio rore.
263 πορφύρεντικαί στῆλαι.
5 *purpureis* agitatum fluctibus Hellen.
264 δισσοῦς εἰδὲ τις νεανίας.
17 delphinum currere *uidi*.
266 ἀκροῖσι δακτύλοισι πορθμεῖων ἔχρος.
269 ἀνέσχε χεῖρε.
II uix *primas* extollens gurgite *palmas*.
269 καὶ προσήεσθ' εἰσιδὼν.
10 *quaeque* tibi *excepi* (sc. uota).
276 ναυτίλον ἐφθαρμένον.
1 *fracta* carina.
277 θάσσειν φύραγγ(α).
19 summo me mittere *saxo*.

In view of these parallels it is not altogether fanciful to suppose that *agitata fluctibus Hellen* is suggested by the Ἑλλην- of 259 Ἑλληνικαῖσιν ἐξε-φοινίχθη ῥοαῖς, where the colour comes in again.

The dream which Propertius describes so vividly may, as Dr. Postgate thinks, have been a real occurrence; but even assuming that it was, I should be disposed to find the genuine details only in lines 1-4 and 19-20. When the poet came to work up the incident, he would embroider his theme with his usual mythological allusions. At the time of composition he had at the back of his mind the passage from the *Iphigenia in Tauris*. The link between the two may be found in the dream of Iphigenia, which is introduced and dismissed in words which seem to find an echo in the first and last lines of this elegy:

44 ἔδοξ' ἐν ὕπνῳ τῆσδ' ἀπαλλαχθεῖσα γῆς
οἰκέειν ἐν Ἄργεϊ.

I uidi te in somnis.

569 ψευδεῖς ὄνειροι, χαίρετ'· οὐδὲν ἦρ' ἄρα.

20 cum mihi discussit talia uisa metus.

We may expect to find in a studious poet like Propertius such reminiscences from his reading, but it is not easy to decide whether they are conscious or subconscious. Perhaps two passages from Kipling will serve as illustrations. The song at the end of *The Finest Story in the World* concludes with:

Greet me, O Sun,
Dominant master and absolute lord
Over the soul of one!

which recalls Richard Crashaw's *Hymn to the Admirable Saint Teresa*:

Love, thou art absolute, sole Lord
Of life and death.

Again in the following passage from *The Village that Voted* there is an unmistakable echo of Shelley's lines written among the Euganean hills:

A few days passed which were like nothing except, perhaps, a suspense of fever, in which the sick man perceives the searchlights of the world's assembled navies in act to converge on one minute fragment of wreckage—one only in all the black and agony-strewn sea.

WILLIAM KERRY.

The University of Melbourne.

NOTES

CIL. I. 1538 (= VI. 335).

R. MAG. LVDOS
her COLEI. MAGNO
NEO. FECIT

—'litteris bonis et alte incisis,' Mommsen, writing in 1863. The stone was found on the Appian way between the sixth and seventh milestones from Rome. Mommsen pointed out that in v. 1 R is the last letter of the cognomen of the 'magister' who conducted the games in honour of Hercules 'magnus.' It is therefore clear that a large portion of the stone on the left has perished, though exactly how much it is impossible to say. Nevertheless the suggestion is perhaps worth considering that the inscription refers to the worship of Hercules Magnus Custos, which was centred at the temple of Hercules bearing that name in the Campus Martius and near the Circus Flaminius. For v. 2 Mommsen offered no suggestion,

NO. CCLXXXI. VOL. XXXV.

and it is hard to see that any could be offered which would be anything more than a guess. But when we come to v. 3 the proposal which he did make is certainly what he described it to be. He wrote: 'quid subsit nescio; nam lusus est quod in mentem mihi uenit: in theatro ligNEO FECIT.' I am not aware of any other conjectural restoration since advanced; Mommsen's was repeated by Bormann thirteen years later in volume vi of the *Corpus*.

Desirable though autopsy is in all such cases I make the following suggestion for what it is worth: (in circo Flami)NEO FECIT. Whether *custodi* or an abbreviated form of the same word was cut also in the same line, or whether it was entered on the stone at all or not, cannot be determined. The probabilities are that it was entered, because, except in literature (for example, Horace *Carm.* iv. 5. 36 'et magni memor Herculis,' where *magnus*

E

is simply 'mighty' and not a genuine 'epitheton' at all), we nowhere find a *Hercules Magnus*. In *CIL*. III. 3651 (Pannonia Inferior) *Herculi M D sac*, if rightly supplemented *Magno Deo*, is different from *Magnus* simply.

It is well known that *-e-* is frequently written instead of *-i-* in many of the older Latin inscriptions, both in the suffix *-ius* and in other places. There is nothing unusual in 'Flamineo'; on the contrary, it agrees well with the date of the inscription, so far as that may be judged from what is left of it, and both agree with the date of the Circus Flaminius (221 B.C.) and that of the temple of Hercules Magnus Custos (before 218 B.C.)

Now in the calendar of Philocalus (A.D. 354) the entry for June 4, the very day on which the festival of Hercules Magnus Custos took place in the temple 'in circo Flaminio,' reads *ludi in Minucia*,¹ that is in the Porticus Minucia (erected 110 B.C.) which was also 'in circo Flaminio'; and Mommsen in his note on that day (*CIL*. I. 2nd ed., in the 'Commentarii Diurni') remarks that these *ludi in Minucia* were evidently connected with the sacrifice to Hercules Magnus Custos at the same place and date. If, then, the proposed restoration of this inscription is correct, the *ludi* which it records would appear to have been a precedent in Republican times, to which the inscription manifestly belongs, for the Imperial *ludi*, with this difference, that instead of being an annual institution they were a single isolated occurrence.

J. WHATMOUGH.

Emmanuel College,
Cambridge.

NOTE ON IGNAT. EP. AD EPH. XX.

Ἐνα ἄρτον κλῶντες ὁ ἐστὶ φάρμακον ἀθανασίας.

LIGHTFOOT, in his note *ad loc.*, gives no example of *φάρμακον*; but, in addition to the instances quoted in L.S., cf. Clem. Alex. *Strom.* vii. 868 with J. B. Mayor's note. For a parallel (which I have not seen referred to in this con-

nexion) see an inscription discovered in 1884 at Oinoanda in Lycia. This inscription was put up by one Diogenes who says: 'I desired to employ this colonnade publicly τὰ τῆς σωτηρίας προσθεῖναι φάρμακα' (alluding to his epicurean object that life should become 'pleasant' to us—τῆς μετ' εὐθυμίας χαρᾶς).

E. H. BLAKENEY.

Winchester College.

HORATIANA.

PROFESSOR TUCKER'S suggestion that in Horace S. I. 3. 117, ff. 'nam ut ferula caedas meritum maiora subire | uerbera non uereor' should be a parenthesis is, I believe, the first reasonable attempt to reconcile the claims of grammar and sense with that of the manuscript tradition. Its weakness is this. His interpretation 'For as for your not going so far as to use the cane on one who deserves a more severe castigation, I have no fear of that' involves a formal inconsistency in the thought of the sentence. Horace says, 'I do not fear you will visit an offender who has deserved a severer castigation with a lighter,' and *maiora* can only mean *quam ferulae*. The 'lighter' castigation, then, should be that with the *ferula*, but with Professor Tucker's interpretation it must be something different, unspecified. It is no doubt true that Horace in his *Satires* is purposely easy-going as regards formal consistency, e.g. in S. II. 1. 55 compared with *ib.* 52. But this would be a much harsher example. If the new suggestion cannot be accepted, Professor Housman's transposition of *nam ut* and *ne* (in the preceding line) seems the only cure.

In *Epode* 5. 88 I think Professor Tucker underrates the difficulty of *humanam* for *hominum*, a use to which Latin affords no adequate parallels (*suam, nostram uicem* etc. are dissimilar). For *uicem* is not an ordinary noun but one half fossilised into a preposition. I see no escape except by reading *humanum* (gen. plur.) as proposed in my note on Lygdamus (Tib. III.) 4. 26 in *Classical Quarterly* VI. (1912), p. 41, where examples of this genitive of *humanus*

¹ Minicia *cod.*

(=homo) are collected. The sense is 'like mere human beings.'

J. P. POSTGATE.

December, 1920.

VARRO'S *QUAESTIONUM PLAUTINARUM*, LIBRI V.

IN the last book on Roman literature, the excellent new edition of Teuffel's *Römische Literatur*, it is assumed (p. 335) that Varro's *Quaestiones* dealt with vocabulary ('wohl zur Erklärung einzelner dunkler Ausdrücke'). But we have express testimony that they dealt with the incidents of Plautus' life.

The *Liber Glossarum*, which has preserved for us the true reading of Catullus 39, 11 (*C.R.* XXXIII. 105), has a gloss (printed on p. 234 of *Corp. Gloss. Lat.*, Vol. V.):

Plautinarum: Plauti auctoris re<s> gestas.

Mr. Thomson is showing us (in *Class. Quart.* XIV. 87 and elsewhere) that one source of the *Liber Glossarum* was the full, unreduced *Abstrusa Glossary*, and that the chief source of the *Abstrusa Glossary* was a 'variorum' commentary on Virgil which retained much of Donatus' scholia. That this gloss preserves for us the lore of Donatus is quite probable. Servius, who followed in Donatus' footsteps, discusses in the preface to the commentary on the *Aeneid* (p. 4, line 15 of Thilo's edition) the number of Plautus' plays: 'nam Plautum alii dicunt unam et viginti fabulas scripsisse, alii quadraginta, alii centum.'

W. M. LINDSAY.

St. Andrews.

REVIEWS

ROSTAGNI'S *IBIS*.

Ibis. A. ROSTAGNI (Contributi alla Scienza dell' Antichità, Vol. III.). One vol. 4to. Pp. 123. Florence: Felice le Monnier, 1920. Lire 12.

It is said by Ovid in *Ib.* 55 and by Suidas s.u. *Καλλίμαχος* that Callimachus wrote a poem against an enemy of his, one *Ἴβις*. Mr Rostagni contends that they were wrong. There existed a poem of that name and nature, but its author was not Callimachus. This he proves as follows.

He begins by assuming that Ovid's *Ibis* is substantially a translation of the Greek *Ἴβις*. Now not only is there no support for this assumption in Ovid or anywhere else, but there is one couplet of the *Ibis*, 449 sq., which conflicts with it. That couplet therefore Mr Rostagni declares to be interpolated, alleging further that it contradicts Suidas. It does not necessarily contradict him at all, but what if it did? must nobody contradict Suidas except Mr Rostagni? And why not rather declare the sentence in Suidas to be interpolated, on the ground that it contradicts Ovid?

He then remarks that the *Ibis* contains in 299 sq. a reference to an event of the year 213 B.C., too late for Callimachus, and that it contains no reference to any event of later date: the author of the *Ἴβις* therefore belonged to the first part of the second century. But the *Ibis* contains in 631 sq. a reference to the ninth book of Virgil's *Aeneid*, which is too late not only for Callimachus but for Mr Rostagni's pseudo-Callimachus. Ovid himself must have inserted it; and even if the *Ibis* is a copy of the *Ἴβις*, why cannot Ovid have inserted also the reference to Achaeus in 299 sq.? Because it is Greek, says Mr Rostagni, who tacitly assumes that the *Ἴβις* was the only Greek book which Ovid had ever read. For instance, many of the stories to which Ovid in his *Ibis* makes allusion are known to have been told by Callimachus in his *αἴτια*, a work which might be perused, one would think, by the author of the *fasti*; but Mr Rostagni will not allow the *αἴτια* to be Ovid's source for these stories: they must have been in the *Ἴβις* too, and

that is how Ovid came to know of them.

It is thus demonstrated, by assumption piled on assumption, that Callimachus wrote no *Iβis*. But Mr Rostagni will also investigate the personality of Ovid's enemy. He says that Ovid did not know who he was. But Ovid knew his birthplace. Oh, he took that from the *Iβis*. But Ovid also knew his birthday, which he could not take from the *Iβis*, for it is a date in the Roman calendar. Oh, he made that up out of his own head. Cannot Mr Rostagni see that if Ovid specified the birthday and birthplace of an enemy whose very identity was unknown to him he was ensuring that his invective and execrations should miss their mark? Unless this real and unknown person was actually born in Libya on the dies *Alliensis*, which would be a miracle, the *Ibis* does not apply to him; and Ovid may curse till he is black in the face without doing him the slightest injury in this world or the next. And where did Mr Rostagni pick up his extraordinary notion? He says that *Ibis* is the person spoken of in *trist.* I 6 7-16 as defeated by Ovid's wife and friends in an attempt to lay hands on some of his property. Then Ovid must have known who he was: if his wife was such a Mrs Nickleby that she omitted the enemy's name in relating his actions, Ovid would have written to ask for it; he would not have sat down in easily remediable ignorance to pen 600 lines of verse and discharge them at the circle of the horizon. But in *trist.* I 6 13 he contemptuously calls this person *nescioquis*, an insignificant creature; and that has done the mischief: Mr Rostagni takes this word to mean that Ovid really did not know whom he was talking about. His Latin scholarship indeed is not of the best: in the verse 'siue idem simili pinus quem morte peremit' he construes *idem* with *pinus* and translates 'il medesimo albero'.

Mr Rostagni has also much to say upon the scholia of Ovid's *Ibis*. These often offer us explanations which we know to be figments, because we understand Ovid's allusions, which the

scholiasts did not. But wherever we do not understand his allusions Mr Rostagni is prepared to believe that the scholiasts did, and listens with eager credulity to convicted liars. More yet. These scholiasts, except the most respectable of them, the scholiast of the cod. Phillippicus, enrich their notes with Latin elegiacs and hexameters, redolent of the middle ages, which they ascribe to persons whose names they found in Ovid and Fulgentius; not merely to Roman poets like Tibullus and Propertius and Gallus but to Greek poets like Arion and Callimachus and to mere vocables like *Lupercus* and *Menephron*. Mr Rostagni will have it that these concoctions, many of them made out of Ovid's own words, are translations of Greek verses preserved in Greek scholia on the *Iβis*. Greek verses of Tibullus and Propertius and Gallus? Well, not exactly; but *Gallus* is a corruption of *Callimachus* (as also are *Darius* and *Clarus* and *Calixto* and *Calmethes* and even *Promptius*), and *Tibullus* and *Propertius* are corruptions of the names of other Greek poets whom Mr Rostagni has not yet decided to identify. There is a certain *Battus* (*Batus*, *Bacus*, *Bachus*, *Bacchus*) to whom Latin verses are imputed at 259 and 299; and for Mr Rostagni he is Callimachus again, *Battiades*. In truth he is nothing of the sort: he recurs in a similar imposture, *L. Caecilii Minutiani Apuleii de orthographia* § 43, as '*Battus* iambicus poeta Ouidii contubernalis', and his birthplace is Ovid. *trist.* IV 10 47, where the MSS present 'Ponticus heroo, *Battus* (*Batus*, *Bacus*, *Bachus*, *Bacchus*) quoque clarus iambis', and editors read *Bassus* with Scaliger.

Worse argument and vainer conclusions than make up the staple of this treatise are not often met with; but the pains which Mr Rostagni has wasted on it are considerable, and so is his knowledge of recent literature relevant to the subject. One would think however that at pp. 56-8 he must have quoted *Oxyrh. pap.* 1011, published in 1910, if he had ever read it.

A. E. HOUSMAN.

ARISTOTLE'S FOUR BOOKS OF *METEOROLOGICA*.

Aristotle's Four Books of Meteorologica.

Revised, with Index of Words, by
F. H. FOBES. Printed at the Har-
vard University Press, Cambridge,
Mass., U.S.A., 1919. Price 15s. net.

THIS handsome and sumptuous volume shows what pains a scholar will lavish on a task which in the eyes of the 'average sensual man' there is no pleasure in doing and for which there is no reward when done. This is not the first time that the *Meteorologica* has occupied the attention of this scholar, as may be seen from the bibliography in this volume itself. But these tentative efforts, it seems, were only foreshadowings of the substance which is now given to the world.

As a book of this sort is in the nature of things not very accessible, it may be as well to give the Table of Contents, which appears at the end of the volume. The work as a whole is divided into eight parts: 1. Preface, vii-xxiv. 2. On the MSS., xxv-xlii. 3. Bibliography, xlii-xlv. 4. An Epitome taken from the Third Basle Edition, xlv-xlvii. 5. Abbreviations for the MSS., xlvii, xlviii. 6. *The Meteorologica* I.-IV. 7. Index of Words, 165-221. 8. Pagination, etc., of the Various Editions, 223-234. In addition to the above, we may mention that page v is wholly devoted to the filial inscription—*Parentibus Sacrum*. At the end of the preface there is a grateful acknowledgment of indebtedness to Mr. W. D. Ross and many others, including E. M. Webster, who died in France for his country (U.S.A.); thanks also are paid to the Syndics of the Harvard Press for undertaking the work.

From the preface it appears that it is the main object of the editor to bring into play more MSS. than Bekker had done before him. If he cannot get back to the pristine integrity of the original writer, at least he hopes to approach

more nearly to the authority of the archetype, which he has convinced himself underlies all the MSS. The two manuscripts to which Mr. Fobes ascribes the greatest authority in all matters, including orthography, are those which he calls E and J.

In the second part of the work (*De Codicibus*, pp. xxv-xlii) we are told that those MSS. which are marked with a star have not been seen by the editor, and that those which are marked with a dagger have only been looked at here and there. As therefore the larger number of manuscripts have neither star nor dagger, we are left in amazement at the number of manuscripts which have been carefully examined.

The Bibliography (*Notitia Litteraria*) shows personal acquaintance with many books and papers, since there are only two stars and no daggers in the whole list.

The Analysis (*Epitome*) of the four books of the *Meteorologica* is one of the rare instances in which we find a direct desire to help the reader towards the right understanding of the subject-matter.

I have heard it said a long time ago that the end of scholarship is translation; nor do I wish now to quarrel with the author of that apophthegm. But what if the text be unsound? In that case the scholar may be trying to translate something which the author never wished to say or which has no meaning at all. From that evil we shall not suffer if Mr. Fobes' care can accomplish our deliverance. He has shown himself willing even to construct a special dictionary for the four books of the *Meteorologica*. The only charge, therefore, that can reasonably be brought against him is that he has taken too much pains. But he must be allowed to judge himself whether the game is worth the candle.

ST. GEORGE STOCK.

THE WORKS OF ARISTOTLE TRANSLATED INTO ENGLISH.

OECONOMICA.

The Works of Aristotle translated into English: Oeconomica. By E. S. FORSTER, M.A., Lecturer in Greek at the University of Sheffield, formerly scholar of Oriel College, Oxford. Clarendon Press, 1920.

THE translation here given of the *Oeconomica* seems to me to be very well done. Where the result is unsatisfactory the fault generally lies, not with the translator, but with the original which he has to translate.

The two small treatises known as the *Economics* A and B manifestly emanate from the Peripatetic School. They have the crabbedness of lecture notes, the incertitude of meaning, and the neglect of style, which mark the disciples of Aristotle. They have also the haunting suggestion of unsoundness in the text which hangs round some of the undisputed works of Aristotle himself.

The parts of Mr. Forster's works are: 1. Preface. 2. Contents. 3. *Oeconomica* I. 4. *Oeconomica* II. 5. Index.

The Table of Contents is good as far as it goes, but it does not go very far, as it consists only of a few lines.

The Index is excellent, and must have cost great labour.

Let us now examine, or at least notice, some particular passages in the translation:

How comes it that in 1343a, 22 Hesiod is quoted thus:

First and foremost a house, then a wife . . . the end of the line being suppressed? As a whole it runs thus:

Οἶκον μὲν πρότιστα, γυναῖκά τε βοὴν τ' ἀροτῆρα.

The answer to the above question clearly is, 'because there is some MS. authority for doing so.' But how can *γυναῖκα* in the line in question be translated by 'wife,' when Hesiod hastens to add:

κτητῆν, οὐ γαμετῆν, ἥτις καὶ βοῦσιν ἔποικτο.

1344b, 19. 'As is the case in a city.' Perhaps the meaning would be brought out better by saying, 'any more than in a state.'

1347a, 13. 'To come against them.'

Ought it not to be 'to come to them'? Hostility is expressed a few lines further on by ἐπὶ with the acc. ἐπὶ τοὺς ἐν Βοσπόρῳ τυράννους.

In 1324b, 17 τοὺς οἰκέτας would be rendered better by 'domestics' than by 'households.'

1438a, 14. Instead of 'told them that their city, which was his capital, was unfortified,' ought we not to have here 'told them that this city of his, though it was their mother-city, was unfortified'?

1345a, 16. 'To make a man healthy and wealthy and wise.' A very happy *tour de force* for:

καὶ πρὸς ὑγίειαν καὶ οἰκονομίαν καὶ φιλοσοφίαν χρήσιμον.

1351a. 'Each wishing to retain their own temple.' 'Each' is an awkward word to deal with.

1352a, 27. 'Affronted.' καταφρονεθῆ is rather 'to be held in contempt.'

1352b, 30. Perhaps 'armies' is here a slip for soldiers.'

1352b, 32. 'Brought in.' But 'brought up' is the regular word for a journey to the capital.

1352b, 34. 'The slaves who were to serve in the army.' Does it not mean 'to look after the camp'?

ST. GEORGE STOCK.

ATHENIENSIIUM RESPUBLICA.

The Works of Aristotle translated into English: Atheniensium Respublica. By SIR FREDERIC G. KENYON, K.C.B., F.B.A., Hon. Fellow of Magdalen and New Colleges. Oxford at the Clarendon Press, 1920.

WHEN *The Constitution of Athens* was first given to the world of letters about thirty years ago, a distinguished scholar, especially devoted to Aristotle, was asked why he had not read this lately discovered work. His reply was, 'There are many of Aristotle's works which I have not read.' As it is possible that some scholars may not even yet have read *The Constitution of Athens*, it may be as well to say a few words about it.

The work of Sir Frederic G. Kenyon, which lies before us, consists of these

parts: Preface; Contents; Translation (chaps. 1-69) with Notes; Index.

In the short preface of one page we are told several things. One is that the translation was originally made for Messrs. Bell and Son 'shortly after the first appearance of the Greek Text, 1891,' . . . and is now 'issued with their concurrence.' The whole of the translation has been revised, and the last six chapters (64-9) are now translated for the first time. The text on which the translation is based is naturally that of the papyrus now in the British Museum. Before that treasure was found there was nothing but the fragments collected from various authors, which had only left scholars like Oliver 'asking for more.'

The Table of Contents falls into two parts. The first forty-one chapters are a sketch of Athenian constitutional history, while in chapter 42 to the end we have a description of the constitution of Athens in the fourth century B.C. Thus we may be said to be given first the dynamics and afterwards the statics of the same subject. Sir Frederic tells us that in translating he has tried 'to follow the matter-of-fact, unadorned style of the original.' He has, and that with most happy results. For what we find, where conditions in the original are at all favourable, is a narrative in a beautiful flowing style. Take for instance chapter 6 or 15.

The translator tells us that he has not in the notes discussed the historical value of the treatise, a declaration which exonerates the critic from attempting anything of the kind.

The Index seems to be as full as one could wish. 'The references are to chapters and sections.' This last arrangement involves the awkwardness of having two different systems of reference within the same cover. But personally I am thankful for it, if I may be allowed to give utterance to a purely personal, and perhaps irrational, prejudice. It is long familiarity, I suppose, that endears me to the old chapter and verse of Bekker.

The verse renderings which we come across must be pronounced a success, especially if we bear in mind that what passes for poetry is a political brochure. All the passages given are from Solon

(5 §§ 2, 3, 12), except when they are from drinking-songs (19 § 3, 20 § 5).

The metre most used is well chosen. There is rumbling as of thunder in the long sonorous line. The words in 5 § 2,

As I mark the oldest home of the ancient Ionian
race
Slain by the sword,

are open to the fallacy of division, for the incautious reader might well take 'slain by the sword' as being predicated, not of 'the Ionian race,' but of its 'oldest home,' which is absurd.

Now let me offer some petty criticisms which will serve to show how hard it is to bring forward any criticisms at all.

In 12 § 3 we have the words, 'And again elsewhere he speaks about the persons who wished to redistribute the land.' Can this be considered a translation of *καὶ πάλιν διαγνώθῃ ποῦ λέγει περὶ τῶν διανεύμασθαι τὴν γῆν βουλομένων*? Literally translated, I suppose this must run as follows: 'And again discern where he speaks about those who wish to distribute the land.'

The name of Cypselus is in the translation (17 § 4), but is not in the Index.

What is Orëum in the text (33 § 1) becomes Oreus in the Index. Which is right?

'Thessalus was much junior in age' (18 § 2). Is the pleonasm called for?

The *Atheniensium Respublica* offers many points of interest. To Herodotus, Thucydides, and Xenophon may now be added a fourth great authority on Athenian history; chronology is aided by new names of Archons, and new technical terms are made known to us (e.g. 64 § 2 *ἐμπέκτος*); but most interesting of all, to my mind at least, is to find Aristotle appearing in a new character, that of an historian, and that the most philosophical kind of historian, namely, the constitutional historian. If Aristotle's actual authorship is challenged by anyone, let me refer him to Sir Frederic G. Kenyon himself, who said nigh thirty years ago (*Aristotle on the Constitution of Athens*, p. xviii): 'The evidence, internal and external, tends strongly to show that Aristotle himself was its author.'

ST. GEORGE STOCK.

RES METRICA.

Res Metrica. An Introduction to the Study of Greek and Versification. By the late WILLIAM ROSS HARDIE. Pp. xxi+275. Clarendon Press, 1920. 7s. 6d. net.

THIS interesting book is strangely unlike anything that could have been written in France or Germany or America. Professor Hardie knew this well, and in his preface he anticipates with grim humour the reception which it may expect from Mr. White and his masters, 'if they condescend to notice it at all.' Of his own account of Aeolic verse and of the structure of the *Enoplii* he writes, with dangerous moderation: 'Though it does not rest on complete knowledge of the evidence, it does not rest on complete ignorance of it either.' The book as a whole is not, indeed, a very logical structure. Its gradual and undesigned growth is described in the preface, and might perhaps have been guessed without it. It began with an account of Horace's lyric metres, and that chapter (now the last) remains the most satisfying in the book. Here Professor Hardie is perfectly at home. He is always excellent on problems of stress and ictus. He has a clear idea of Horace's aims and methods, and deals admirably with the metrical theories which influenced him: moreover his long experience of Horatian teaching is strikingly apparent. The book (as he frequently insists) is a textbook, and, above all, a textbook for teachers. He gives an excellent scheme for an introductory course of Horatian study (based partly on metrical, partly on literary and historical grounds), which includes nearly half the odes. He does nothing like this for Pindar—with him he is content to remark that it is wiser (on metrical grounds) to begin with the Fourth Pythian than with the First Olympian. The chapters on the Greek and Roman hexameter are interesting. They show wide knowledge of earlier statistics, and much laborious research: but he never forgets the treacherous nature of statistics, and the difficulty of preliminary definition:

and he effectively 'disables' much elaborate theory by challenging the soundness of its assumptions. In particular, he holds that too much attention has been paid to breaks between words, without reference to rhetorical pauses. On the Latin elegiac, again, he is excellent, but on the Greek elegiac he is inadequate: he seems to be unaware of the strictness of Alexandrian rules. On the iambic trimeter he is interesting, and especially on the Latin senarius: here he gives valuable statistics of Roman metrical practice from the earliest poets to Seneca.

The most controversial chapters deal with Greek lyric and with the Saturnian. In neither case has Professor Hardie found a master-key, but he states the prevailing views with scrupulous care. On Greek lyric, indeed, he has strong negative opinions: though generally cautious in expressions, he is obviously convinced that most recent theories are wrong. In two *excursus* (pp. 136 to 143, and 177 to 195) he discusses Aeolic verse and the dactylo-epitrite in considerable detail, with especial attention to the alleged fifth-century evidence. He quotes Blass and Schroeder occasionally, but he deals chiefly with Mr. White's *Verses of Greek Comedy*. His standpoint may be illustrated by a quotation: 'The choriamb-ionic scansion divorces the metre from similar lyrics which clearly consist of dactyls and trochees. . . . What is the "epitritus" but the shortest trochaic *κῶλον*? And the enoplii but a group of dactyls, not the shortest possible, but a short and effective one? Can we imagine a poet—not in India or in Persia, but in Greece—inventing a metre which consists of a choriamb and an "Ionicus a maiore"? Some of the quadrisyllabists themselves do not deny the relation to dactylo-trochaic lyrics. But if it is admitted, the choriamb-ionic scheme becomes merely a possible aspect of the group of syllables, a later interpretation or a special musical setting—a thing with which the ordinary reader need not concern himself' (p. 179). He is inclined to conclude (p. 195) 'that the Ionic-

choriambic-diiambic-ditrochaic scansion would be impossible for a reader, ancient or modern.'

It is regrettable that Professor Hardie does not seem to have known Walter Headlam's work in this field. Though he would perhaps have been suspicious of musical parallels, he would have appreciated the general spirit of Headlam's treatment, especially his breadth of view and his impatience of foot-chopping. As they stand, his own chapters on Greek lyric are not very readable, from the lack of unifying generalisations.

The book is practically complete; but Professor Hardie left one gap (Greece 200 to 100 B.C.) in the useful table 'Chronologia Metrica' at the end: this has not been filled in. In the same table (p. 272) we read (for the period 300 to 200 B.C.): 'Philosophy again expressed in verse.' This implies the mention of the earlier philosophical poets, but they are in fact omitted. There is no index.

In conclusion, a few sentences may be quoted to illustrate the vigour of Professor Hardie's style, and his keen common-sense. 'In Horace's line "vade, vale, cavē ne titubes" there is no metrical question about *cave*. The syllable *was* short, and no metrical principle had to operate upon it to make it so' (p. 46). 'Further, shorter words' (he is comparing English and ancient verse) 'mean that more thought, more turns or articulations of thought, will be contained in the same number of syllables; the length of the line for the apprehending mind will thus be greater, and it is this mental *tempo* that is important' (p. 96). 'Schroeder says of this: "Platonis locum . . . procul habere satius erit." "Procul habere" is a good thing to do with a passage that does not prove what it is taken to prove' (p. 182).

D. S. ROBERTSON.

Trinity College, Cambridge.

LATIN EPIGRAPHY.

Latin Epigraphy. An Introduction to the Study of Latin Inscriptions. By Sir JOHN EDWIN SANDYS, Litt.D., F.B.A. One vol. Pp. xxiii + 324. Fifty illustrations. Cambridge: University Press, 1919. 12s. 6d. net.

THE case for the inclusion of epigraphy in a rational scheme of classical study has been briefly and adequately put by Cagnat in the introduction to his *Cours d'Épigraphie latine*: 'Ce n'est, à vrai dire, que l'un des éléments, mais c'est un élément essentiel de la philologie, l'une des sources auxquelles doit puiser quiconque veut connaître la religion, les lois, l'histoire politique, la vie privée et le langage des anciens.' The vogue of epigraphical study in France—witness the four editions of Cagnat's stately work—rests on something more than a recognition of the value of the *Corpus* to classical students in general. The French student of the Classics is pretty sure to spend his life—whether as a teacher in France, or as an administrator in Africa or Syria, or as a priest in Asia Minor—

in close contact with epigraphical discovery and the discussion of epigraphical problems. At a given moment it may devolve on him to make a copy of an inscription, just discovered, and soon to disappear. Actual experience of discovery, the ubiquity of collections of inscriptions, and a natural interest in the rich Roman remains of his country, predispose the French student to take the study of epigraphy seriously. With us it is otherwise. Few British students of the Classics are likely to be brought, as a matter of course, into contact with problems of epigraphy, either at home or in their usual haunts abroad. If it is to appeal to more than a few specialists, epigraphical study must find its justification, for us, in the sentence quoted from Cagnat. The epigraphist must convince us that a knowledge of his craft, and of its products, is an essential element in a good classical education. The teacher of epigraphy in this country should aim primarily at weaving his subject into the web of classical studies, and take

his chance of turning out an occasional epigraphist. No other discipline is so likely to inculcate accurate habits of work and a demand for precise knowledge. No classical discipline approaches so closely to the objectivity of science. And in many departments of inquiry, where the silence of literature excites and baffles curiosity, the inscriptions provide us with a rich store of information.

It is from the British point of view that Sir John Sandys envisages his task. His Introduction began its career as an article in the Cambridge *Companion to Latin Studies*. The 324 pages of its present form endeavour to cover the ground occupied by the foreign Introductions, and to introduce new features germane to the author's purpose and most welcome to the classical student. The reader learns with a shock that this is the first introduction to classical Latin epigraphy published in England. The epigraphist rubs his eyes when he finds the *ἀναγκαῖότητα* of his tool-bag—the whole of Cagnat's *deuxième partie*—relegated to the appendices. Cagnat, whose aim is to train epigraphists, takes his reader through a course of nomenclature, the *cursus honorum*, the Imperial titles and chronology, before he 'is permitted to reach the study of the actual inscriptions.' Sir John Sandys, who set out to write a book 'which might be useful to classical students who were interested in Latin literature, but were not necessarily aiming at becoming specialists in epigraphy,' gives prominence to the 'humaner' aspects of the subject, and has the credit of having written the first introduction to Latin epigraphy fit for perusal in the train, or in an easy chair.

A select bibliography (which should perhaps include, on p. xx, a reference to the *Revue épigraphique*, which, with its lamented editor, fell in the war) is followed by chapters on Latin Inscriptions in Classical Authors (a new and welcome feature) and on Modern Collections of Latin Inscriptions, both in the best style of the author of the *History of Classical Scholarship*. Next, after giving us a lucid exposition of the epigraphical alphabet, admirably illus-

trated, the author devotes six chapters to the different categories of inscriptions, broadly distinguished as *tituli* and documentary inscriptions, the former including Epitaphs, Dedications, Honorary Inscriptions, Inscriptions on Public Works, and Inscriptions on Portable Objects. There follow chapters on Language and Style, and on Restoration and Criticism. Then come the six appendices—the first three of which the epigraphist cannot help likening to the proverbial feminine postscript—I. Names; II. Officials; III. Emperors; IV. Six Historical Inscriptions (including the Monumentum Ancyranum, and all discreetly annotated); V. Sixty Inscriptions exemplifying Abbreviated Phrases; VI. Abbreviations. The value of the book is enhanced by the fifty illustrations, which are representative of every aspect of the subject, well reproduced, and scattered (as illustrations ought to be) throughout the book to catch the eye at the right moment.

That the work, on its technical side, is competently and accurately done goes without saying. A happy feature is the author's skill—an uncanny *felicitas*—in choosing his examples, and illustrating them from literature, whether the Latin writers, or Tennyson, or Byron. The footnotes are so good that one is set wishing for more of them—e.g., on 'supra medicos' on p. 74, or on 'ossa inferre licebit' on p. 77. I have noted misprints on p. 41 (*praidad* without *de* in the transcription) and on p. 111 (*publicarum* for *publicorum*).

I will close with two observations, which are submitted for what they are worth, to the author and his readers.

In the first place, I grudge the space given in the chapter on Epitaphs to the discussion of a point which (so far as it concerns epigraphy) belongs properly to a special monograph on the inscriptions of Southern Gaul. Four precious pages are lavished on one out of a hundred interesting points of detail—the expression *sub ascia*. Surely in a matter of this sort a British Introduction need not try to improve on Cagnat! A footnote on p. 81 reminds us that the *ascia* of Lyons has not escaped the attention of the historians of religion, and that the author himself has taken a

hand in the discussion. Interesting as the question of the *ascia* is, I should like to see the space it occupies in the book given, in a future edition, to a longer discussion of the provisions made for protecting the tomb, and of the cult of the dead.

Secondly, I would suggest to the author that his second edition should contain a chapter on "How to Use the Evidence of Inscriptions," directing the student to the indices of the *Corpus* or of Dessau, and showing him by means of a few practical examples how to

weave the information contained in groups of inscriptions, or the mere statistics of their distribution in space and time, into a reasoned account of some feature of ancient history—say, the organisation of a *saltus* in Africa, or the use of Latin in the East. The discussion of the *Ascia* might well find a place in such a chapter.

For the book, as it stands, the epigraphist and the teacher and student of classical literature owe its author a deep debt of gratitude.

W. M. CALDER.

ΠΕΡΙ ΓΑΜΟΥ.

Περὶ γάμων: *Antiquorum poetarum philosophorumque Graecorum de matrimonio sententiae e quibus mediae nouaeque comoediae iudicia locique communes illustrentur.* Scripsit FRIDERICUS BUDDENHAGEN BASILIENSIS. Particula I. Pp. 58. Turici: Typis Gebr. Leemann and Co., MCMXIX.

THIS dissertation, part of a thesis in very Teutonic Latin for the Ph.D. of the University of Bâle, suffers from two handicaps, neither of which is in any way the fault of its author. The first is, that he was obliged to change his original purpose of writing three chapters (on marriage, on slavery, and on country life), as set forth in the New Comedy and in contemporary, earlier, and later poetry and philosophy, on account of the vast and unwieldy bulk of material; and that even after omitting the proposed second and third chapters, he found that Legrand's *Daos* had to a large extent anticipated him, and so was reduced to writing a sort of history of ancient views on marriage, from Hesiod down. Homer he omits as belonging to another world than the later writers. The second, and for a reviewer the more annoying, is that post-war conditions obliged him to print a mere fragment of the work, with a summary of the rest.

The part which he has been able to print traces from the story of Pandora and the precepts about matrimony in the *Works and Days*, down through Simonides of Amorgos' apologue and into the times of Sokrates, the well-

worn commonplaces about the good and bad points of women, the advantages and defects of marriage and parenthood, and so forth, together with some treatment of a few of the great female characters in Tragedy. Unfortunately, just as the subject is getting really interesting—i.e., when Euripides and Aristophanes appear—the work breaks off, and we are left with a table of contents.

So far as can be judged from what we have, the dissertation was worth writing, and the material has been well arranged. One or two details, however, call for less favourable comment.

The first is that so little is said about the relation of these τόποι to the folklore and proverbial wisdom of Greece and other lands. A brief mention (p. 16, n. 1) of folklore parallels for Simonides' apologue is the only hint of this which the present reviewer has noticed; and it is surely of importance, even from the most narrowly philological point of view, to realise that a later author, who seems to imitate Simonides or Hesiod, may be writing down what he heard from his nurse.

With this goes the author's failure to consider to what extent sociological facts may have influenced the authors, literary or other, of these sayings. To understand what a Greek said on any subject it is, first of all, necessary to realise under what conditions he lived; and this was never more necessary than now, when so much that is uncritical is written about the social organisation of early Greece. We regret in this con-

nexion to notice (p. 45, n. 6) that apparently one or two writers (our author himself has more good sense) still incline to believe the tale of Sokrates' two wives; a poor ghost of a tradition which

we thought Bentley (*Epist. of Socrates* xiii.) had decently laid nearly 225 years ago.

H. J. ROSE.

*University College,
Aberystwyth.*

A STUDY OF WOMEN IN ATTIC INSCRIPTIONS.

A Study of Women in Attic Inscriptions.
By HELEN MCCLEES, Ph.D. 8vo.
Pp. iv+51. New York: Columbia
University Press, 1920. \$1.00 net.

THE writer of this interesting and useful little study does not claim that her reading of Attic inscriptions relating to women has 'brought to light any fact contrary to our knowledge of the manner of life or position in society of Athenian women derived from literary and artistic sources.' But the evidence of the inscriptions is valuable, she holds, in the first place as amplifying by the amount of detail it contributes the knowledge of women's life derived from other sources, and in the second place as modifying the view of the matter given by Greek literature alone. For 'the inscriptions . . . show that in practice there was much to render the lot of Athenian women comparatively happy and normal.' Thus the numerous sepulchral inscriptions bear witness to much appreciation of the character of women. The number of dedications made by women, including money con-

tributions and objects of value, show that the position of women in regard to property was not so humiliating in practice as it was in strict law. Again, the inscriptions relating to priestesses and religious associations in which women were concerned indicate that at least in one sphere outside the family—the sphere of religion and religious observances—women could find scope for their intelligence, their taste, and their practical ability.

Miss McClees thus summarises her conclusions in her Introduction, and then proceeds to give the reader opportunity to substantiate them by a careful study of the Attic inscriptions of all periods, which relate to women, under six headings (Religious Associations and Public Honours, Dedications, Tabellae Defixionum, Trade and Occupations, Mortgage and Boundary Inscriptions, Sepulchral Inscriptions).

The Appendix contains a list of all the Attic inscriptions in which women are mentioned, arranged under the same headings.

H. RICHARDSON.

ANCIENT ARMENIA.

L'Arménie entre Byzance et l'Islam, depuis la Conquête Arabe jusqu'en 886. Par J. LAURENT. (Bibliothèque des Écoles Françaises d'Athènes et de Rome, Fascicule 117.) One vol. Octavo. Pp. xii+398. One outline map. Paris: Fontemoing-Boccard, 1919.

M. LAURENT'S book fully maintains the standard of scholarship set in former volumes of the famous series in which it is published. Within the period it covers, it is practically an exhaustive work, and in his introduction the author promises further

volumes, which will carry the story through the Byzantine domination and the Turkish invasion to the establishment of a new Armenia in the Cilician hills and its entente with the Crusaders from the West. The present volume gives a most interesting picture of Armenian feudal society before the blows of the Seljuks and the cultural influence of the Latins had transformed it. But one might criticise M. Laurent for taking the Arab conquest as his starting-point, instead of going back to the origins of the society he describes. The background of his scene is the ancient independent king-

dom of Armenia and its conversion to Christianity, and in treating the seventh, eighth, and ninth centuries he is constantly compelled to carry us back to the fourth, fifth, and sixth. Much of the material he marshals for us (and he errs on the side of prolixity) properly falls outside the limits which he nominally assigns himself in this volume. This is also true of the bibliography, but in this case we have no fault to find. He gives us a magni-

ficent tableau of the sources—Arabic and Armenian and Greek—as well as the modern secondary works relating to his field, and the value of the list is greatly increased by the concise critical notes on the authors. The book is dedicated by the author to Professor Charles Diehl, and adds to the number of those written under that great scholar's inspiration.

A. J. TOYNBEE.

THE STYLE AND LITERARY METHOD OF LUKE.

The Style and Literary Method of Luke :

I. The Diction of Luke and Acts.

Harvard Theological Studies (VI.).

By H. J. CADBURY. 9½" x 6½". Pp.

viii+72. Cambridge: Harvard Uni-

versity Press; London: Milford,

1919.

THIS is Part I. of a monograph which is to extend to 205 pages and cost three dollars. The present instalment deals with: (i.) The size of Luke's vocabulary (calculations are made which entail most laborious work and are summarised in a few paragraphs); (ii.) the literary standard of Luke's vocabulary; and (iii.) the alleged medical vocabulary of Luke.

In the second section Professor Cadbury warns us at the outset of the limitations of the method. 'Whether a word used by Luke occurs in another writing depends far more on the chance of subject-matter and the size of the writings compared than on any real affinity of language.' Luke is known to be dependent on Mark, but so far as vocabulary goes he has more in common with 2 Maccabees, though there is nothing to show that he knew the last-named book. The basis of Professor Cadbury's comparison is Schmid's 'Atticismus,' which analyses the vocabularies of Dio Chrysostom, Lucian, Aristides, Aelian, and the younger Philostratus. The result is that 'the vocabulary of Luke, while it has its natural affiliations with the Greek of the Bible, is not so far removed from the literary style of the Atticists as to be

beyond comparison with them.' The author is inclined to revolt from the present overrating of the popular and non-literary elements in the Greek Testament.

The third section is good reading. That the author of Luke-Acts was a physician is generally thought to have been demonstrated by Hobart with his mass of evidence. Harnack and others have strengthened the argument by using the most convincing instances only. It is these that Professor Cadbury tests rigorously. In nearly every case he shows that a fuller vocabulary, due to a wider range of culture, is sufficient to account for the alleged medical language. Many of the test-words are the ordinary words for ordinary experiences. Medical language with us consists of using derivatives from the Greek; Greeks who had complaints described them in one way only—the current Greek term. Professor Moore, one of the editors of this series, adds a note on *κραϊπάλη*, which describes a sick headache after a debauch. This word, which Galen (quoted by Wetstein) says is the common Greek word for this common experience, is actually claimed by Harnack, Zahn, and Moffatt as a proof of acquaintance with medical phraseology.

'The beloved physician' may well have written the third Gospel and Acts, but after this book little or no confidence can be felt in the argument from language. After all, why should we have ever expected to find reminiscences of Hippocrates, etc.? What

doctor of our acquaintance, writing on a religious subject, if he had any sense of literary fitness, would betray his

knowledge of technical medical science?

W. K. LOWTHER CLARKE.

SHORT NOTICES

Juristische Papyri. Von P. M. MEYER.
Pp. xx + 380. Berlin: Weidmann,
1920. M. 22.

This book is designed as an introduction for the non-expert to the legal side of papyri, a purpose for which it is well designed. It contains ninety-six texts (mostly Greek, a few Latin), selected and classified to illustrate the main topics of Graeco-Roman law—types of legal documents, law of persons, law of contract, of property, criminal law and legal procedure, with their various sub-divisions. Besides the full prefaces and annotations which accompany the individual texts, the sections are each preceded by a general introductory survey giving in a concise form the preliminary information necessary for an intelligent study of the succeeding documents. The ground covered is, of course, much the same as in the *Grundzüge und Chrestomathie* of Mitteis, but this new work justifies its existence not only by the inclusion of a number of fresh texts, but also by the greater wealth of explanatory and illustrative matter suitable to the rather different scope of the author. Professor Meyer is indefatigable in the collection of parallels, and if he sometimes seems to carry this rather to excess, the fault is on the right side. It is a pity that the convenience of readers was not studied by a more adequate method of numbering the lines of the texts. The important 'Gnomon of the Idios Logos,' recently published by the Berlin Museum, is printed as an appendix, with a brief commentary, which delay in the production of the more elaborate exegesis promised by the Museum renders the more welcome. Useful indices complete a very practical volume, which deserved better print, paper, and binding than those accorded to it.

A. S. H.

RESTREPO'S SEMANTICS.

El Alma des Palabras Diseño des Semantica General. By FÉLIX RESTREPO, S.J. One vol. Pp. 234. Four diagrams in text. Barcelona: Imprenta Editorial Barcelonesa, 1917. 4 pesetas.

FATHER RESTREPO, in the modest Preface to his *Soul of Words*, says that up to now 'no one has made a general classification of all the phenomena of semantics.' The statement is not exact. For this was the aim of M. R. de la Grasserie's *Essai d'une Sémantique intégrale* (1908)—an ambitious but unscientific work noticed in this Review, December, 1910, pp. 247 ff., and included (perhaps for the sake of completeness) in the bibliography of Mr. Nyrop's *Grammaire historique* of French (Vol. IV. *Sémantique*), one of Father Restrepo's chief authorities. Father Restrepo is a much safer guide than M. de la Grasserie. He is at least imbued with the principles of modern philological inquiry, and though he has not read as widely as he might have, his use of his material shows judgment and care. This 'Sketch' is not marked by originality or profundity nor by brilliant divination like Bréal's. But at the present time, when semantics is still in the descriptive stage, all that we can expect from a work of this size is that it should be sound as far as it goes and attractive to students; and this the 'Sketch of General Semantics' will on the whole be found to be. I would only suggest to the author that in future he should not limit himself so severely to the discussion of *words*; many phrases 'are semantic unities' (Nyrop, Ch. VII.; or, as I have called them, 'rhemes') and entitled to their place; and that his remarks on Spanish *dar* and Latin *dare* might be improved by reference to Thielmann's *Das Verbum 'dare' im*

Latinischen, 1882. I may add that the book is written in easy Spanish and in an agreeable style. J. P. P.

SALLUST.

Sallust. With an English translation by J. C. ROLFE, Professor of Latin in the University of Pennsylvania. One vol. Pp. xxii + 535. London: W. Heinemann; New York: G. P. Putnam (Loeb Classical Library), 1920. 10s.

SALLUST is a difficult author to translate. Quite apart from his 'immortal speed and brevity,' the peculiar flavour given to his style by archaism and poetic colour can scarcely be reproduced in English without creating an impression of affectation and preciosity. Professor Rolfe has avoided this peril, and produced a readable and straightforward translation. But he has perhaps played for safety to an excessive extent, for his version is somewhat undistinguished, and lacks both the vividness and eloquence which are such marked characteristics of Sallust. A little more freedom of treatment and a slightly richer colouring would have produced something more likely to suggest to the uninstructed reader that Sallust was a great stylist. The translator's is, however, a thankless task, and it would be ungenerous to press this point. The English is clear and correct and the translation accurate. Limits of space preclude detailed criticism. But it may be noted that the translator has scarcely done justice to what is probably the most difficult passage in either the *Jugurtha* or the *Catiline*, viz. the description of the battle on the Muthul (*Jug.* 49. 6), where both the translation and the explanatory note are far from clear, although it would perhaps be going too far to say that they are incorrect. Summers alone of editors has succeeded in giving a really lucid explanation of Metellus' tactics. Again in *Cat.* 4. 2, *res gestas populi Romani carptim . . . perscribere* can scarcely mean 'write a history of the Roman people, selecting such portions,' etc. It is rather 'write the history of selected portions,' etc. Nor, to turn to a point

of style, does 'gore and grief' commend itself as a translation of *cruore et luctu* (*Cat.* 51. 9). The book is, however, a welcome addition to the Loeb series. The text has been judiciously handled, and includes the four speeches and two letters which have survived from the Histories, together with the four pseudo-Sallustian works. There is the usual short bibliography, to which the edition by Summers should surely be added.

H. E. BUTLER.

*University College,
London.*

ORAZIO LIRICO.

Orazio Lirico. Studi di GIORGIO PASQUALI. One volume. Octavo. Pp. ii + 789. Firenze: Felice le Monnier, 1920. L. 25.

SIGNOR PASQUALI has devoted no less than 789 pages to the consideration of Horace as a lyric poet, and has spared no pains to make himself thoroughly acquainted with all that has survived of Greek lyric poetry and with everything in Hellenistic poetry that may conceivably have influenced Horace or served to illustrate him: he has also made an exhaustive study of the work of German scholars on the subject. But he has read more than he has been able to digest—a fact which, not unassisted by a tendency to verbosity, is largely responsible for the inordinate bulk of the book, which might easily have been reduced to at least half its size without essential loss.

The ordinary student of Horace will find little to interest him. A number of odes are examined in detail, and the conclusions arrived at are often sensible enough. When, however, the author breaks fresh ground, it is to be feared that he will find few followers (*e.g.* in his views of I. 18, where he refuses to admit that the last six lines are designed as a warning against excessive indulgence in wine; and again in his interpretation of I. 10).

He further seeks to determine Horace's debt to Alcaeus, and decides that Horace was no mere translator, but takes a line or stanza of Alcaeus as a text to be developed on Romano-Hellenistic lines.

But by far the most useful portion of the book is to be found in his lengthy discussion of Horace's relation to Hellenistic poets. The results as regards Horace are, as in the case of so many modern efforts of 'source-hunting,' somewhat scanty and inconclusive. But much useful information is provided as to the treatment of similar themes in Hellenistic literature, and students of that period of literary history will find not a little of interest, though the process of detaching the ore from the quartz may be somewhat laborious.

H. E. BUTLER.

The Genitive of Value in Latin and other Constructions with Verbs of 'Rating.'
By GORDON J. LAING. Chicago, Ill.

PROFESSOR LAING'S little treatise gives a very good conspectus of the theories hitherto advanced as to the origin of this construction (*magni aestimare*, etc.), and arrives at the conclusion that they are all more or less inadequate; his own view is that this genitive was from the first adverbial and of independent origin. The theory of locative origin, so tempting to English scholars (*magni* = 'at a great price'), fails to account for the equally old *pluris*, *minoris*, etc., and for the parallel Greek constructions *πολλοῦ*, *πλείονος*, etc. The derivations from a partitive gen., from a gen. of quality, and from old Indo-European adverbs in *i* (Wackernagel) are all criticised as failing at some point or other. Laing's own theory is negative rather than positive; and it may be criticised as failing to recognise the affinities between this adverbial gen. and certain types of adnominal genitives. And why has he deliberately left out the gen. of *price*? It is obviously akin to the gen. of *value*, to which he limits his discussion. He might easily have spoken, as Bennett does (*Synt. of Early Latin*, II. p. 93), of the former as a development of the latter. Kühner-Gerth³ (II. 1, p. 377), however, treats both of these constructions together and deals with them as of adnominal origin. In Latin it seems not impossible to find in the common expression *homo nihili* 'a man of naught,'

the original type of usage from which the gen. of value was developed. On this principle *res nihili* would mean 'a thing of naught' (Shakespeare, *M.N.D.* iv. 2-14) and *nihili facere* (*pendere, aestimare*, etc.), which are the most frequently found of all expressions of worthlessness (p. 24), would mean 'to reckon as of naught.' When we have an adjective like *magni*, *parvi*, etc., instead of the noun *nihili*, it is not necessary, I think, to suppose that the noun *pretii* has dropped out (so Landgraf, quoted on p. 3); for *magni*, *parvi*, etc., may be adjectives used as nouns, 'of the great,' 'of the small,' perhaps on the analogy of *nihili*. But I doubt whether a strictly historical account of the origin or development of these various types of usage is within our reach. They are all found side by side in the earliest literature that we have, and we cannot be sure which is prior to which.

I have few criticisms to offer in regard to details; but I suggest that *tanti* in *Juv. X. 97* (p. 17) means 'worth having,' 'worth while' (see p. 18), and that the *ut* in *l. 98* = 'on condition that'; cf. Owen's translation, p. 63;¹ also that in *Hor. Sat. II. 5, 35 cassa nuce pauperet* is not parallel to *empsim vitiosa nuce* (Plaut. *Mil.* 316; p. 36), but contains the abl. which is found with *spoliare*.

E. A. SONNENSCHIEIN.

Phases of Corruption in Roman Administration in the Last Half-Century of the Roman Republic. By R. O. JOLLIFFE. One volume. 8vo. Pp. 109. Menasha, Wisconsin: George Banta Publishing Company, 1919.

MR. JOLLIFFE has written a good specimen of the kind of dissertation required for the doctorate by American Universities. There is in his work little or nothing that is original; but he has summarised clearly and sensibly the evidence for 'graft' by Roman officials in the age of Cicero. He deals with abuses in the army, especially in connexion with furloughs, requisitions,

¹ To take the *ut* as consecutive (so Laing, with Mayor and others) makes havoc of the sense.

and the quartering of troops, and in the navy, especially 'ship-money' and the shameless embezzlements of Verres, and then passes on to the corruption of Roman magistrates and senators by client princes and the misuse of embassies and missions as means to private profits. Sometimes he takes too literally

the wild invectives of Cicero against Piso and Verres; sometimes (pp. 58, 70) he suspects corruption where none can be proved; but, on the whole, he paints us a true if gloomy picture of this deep-seated disease in the administration of the dying Roman Republic.

W. W. H.

CORRESPONDENCE

PLATO, *REPUBLIC* 421A: A REJOINDER.

IF I understand Mr. Ferguson's argument (in *C.R.* XXXV. 17 f.) aright, the main difference between his view and mine is that, whereas he would confine the horizon of the writer's thought to Athens, I would extend it to embrace Sicily. If I am right, γεωμόρους seems at least a tolerable correction; but if he is right, then χορηγούς is much the superior. As against the limitation of the reference to Athens, I would refer to the words (of the objector) in 420A οἷον ἄλλοι κτλ. (with Adam's 'n.'), to the allusion to Syracusan luxury in 404D (cf. *Ep.* 326B), and to Sicilian affairs elsewhere in *Rep.* (e.g. 473D). Moreover, the word πανήγυρις, which Mr. Ferguson regards as a 'clue' word, may well mean

a 'promiscuous gathering' παντοδαπὸν ἀνθρώπων (cf. 604E) rather than an official Athenian festival. Finally, as to γεωμόρους, may not Stallbaum be right when he says (*ad Leges* 737E), 'singulis locis semper videndum, qua vi et potestate vocabulum accipiendum sit'?

R. G. BURY.

CORRECTION.

THE last three lines of the paragraph on Art in the summary of the *Berliner Wochenschrift* (*C.R.*, February-March, 1921) should have read: 'Fig. 142 is a clever modern forgery, copying a relief in the Museo Barracco (LI) with the aid of a plate, published in the *Annali dell' Istituto*, after a lost Madrid copy.'

SUMMARIES OF PERIODICALS

CLASSICAL WEEKLY (NEW YORK).
(1921.)

ART.—Jan. 10. F. Studniczka, *Das Bild Menanders* (Bates). Scholarly and accurate, save for mistakes about American museums.

LITERATURE.—Jan. 17. F. Holland, *Seneca* (Gummere). An interesting sketch of an interesting man.—Jan. 24. J. Geffcken, *Die griechische Tragödie* (Fitch). Brief but suggestive.—A. Körte, *Die griechische Komödie* (Fitch). On the same lines as the preceding, but hardly so well phrased.—Jan. 31. U. von Wilamowitz-Möllendorff, *Die Ilias und Homer* (Bassett). 'Even W.'s analysis is a long step towards the Unitarian position,' though he has hardly a good word for its defenders.—Mar. 28. Helen E. Wieand, *Deception in Plautus* (Rolfe). Carefully done.—R. D. Elliott, *Transition in the Attic Orators* (Van Hook). Thorough but dull.—Agnes C. Vaughan, *Madness in Greek Thought and Custom* (Robinson). Systematic, readable, and sound.—W. C. Summers, *Silver Age of Latin Literature* (Mustard). Praised. M. adds further quotations to show the influence of Silver Latin authors on modern literature.

NUMISMATICS.—Jan. 10. E. A. Sydenham, *Historical References on Coins of the Roman Empire* (Agnes Brett). Warmly commended to students of Roman history.

NO. CCLXXXI. VOL. XXXV.

RELIGION.—Jan. 24. N. Bentwich, *Hellenism* (Allen). A discussion, sometimes monotonous, of Hellenistic Judaism.

SCIENCE.—Mar. 7. T. L. Heath, *Euclid in Greek, Book I.* (Humphreys and D. E. Smith). Highly praised.

Jan. 24 and Feb. 28. Contain useful lists by Grace H. Goodale and W. S. Messer respectively of recent classical articles in non-classical periodicals (written in English, with few exceptions).

GÖTTINGISCHE GELEHRTE ANZEIGEN.

(1918-20.)

ARCHAEOLOGY, ETC.—1920, pp. 116-125. A. Frickenhaus, *Die altgriechische Bühne* [Strassburg, 1917. M. 16] (A. Körte). On the whole disappointing, especially on controversial topics such as Theologeion and Lycurgan stage.

HISTORY.—1919, pp. 419-35. Otto Th. Schulz, *Vom Prinzipat zum Dominat. Das Wesen des römischen Kaisertums des dritten Jahrhunderts* [in Drerup, Grimme, Kirsch, *Studien zur Geschichte und Kultur des Altertums*, IX. 4, 5. Paderborn, 1919. M. 13+20 per cent.] (J. Kromayer). A continuation of his earlier work (*ibid.* 1916) dealing with the first two centuries. An exhaustive collection of material, not however arranged to the best

advantage. S. successfully shows, as against Mommsen, that the *Imperium* could not be legally conferred by acclamation on the part of the army. The reviewer disposes of Schulz's further view that a general *imperium consulare* was an essential element in the Principate, and likewise of the contentions of Gelzer, who tries to support Mommsen on fresh grounds—namely, a 'general' *Imperium* dating from the military oath of 32 B.C.

LINGUISTIC.—1918, pp. 343-62. Alois Walde, *Ueber älteste sprachliche Beziehungen zwischen Kelten und Italikern* [Innsbruck, 1917. Pp. 77] (E. Hermann). W. does not establish a case for his revolutionary view that 'Gälolatinisch' is to be inserted as an intermediate generation in the descent of 'Urkeltsch' and 'Uritalsch' from 'Urindogermanisch'. In points of detail he makes some valuable suggestions, and deserves credit for stimulating a fuller examination of the relations between Celtic and Italic.—1919, pp. 471-2. E. Hermann, *Die Silbenbildung in Griechischen und in den andern indogermanischen Sprachen*. Notice by the author of his forthcoming publication in *Abhandlungen der Gesellschaft der Wissensch. zu Göttingen*, XVII.

PALAEOGRAPHY AND PAPYRI.—1918, pp. 81-126, 126-136. *Oxyrhynchus Papyri*, XI, XII. (Karl Fr. W. Schmidt). An analysis of the principal contents of each volume, discussing also the Hesiod fragments in the former, with some emendations.—1919, pp. 30-43. Ernst von Druffel, *Papyrologische Studien zum byzantinischen Urkundenwesen im Anschluss an P. Heidelberg 311* [= *Münchener Beiträge zur Papyrusforschung*, I. München, 1915. M. 3.50] (A. Steinwenter). Discusses questions of form and publication of Byzantine documents in connexion with this sixth century papyrus. 'Anyone dealing with Byzantine documents will be well advised to invoke frequently the help of this valuable booklet.'

GREEK LITERATURE.—1919, pp. 141-9. Eduard Schwartz, *Zur Entstehung der Ilias* [Strassburg, 1918. M. 3] (E. Bethe). An expanded version of S.'s review of Wilamowitz's *Die Ilias und Homer* (1915), originally printed in *Deutsch. Litt. Zeit.* 1918. B. goes even further than W. and S., and believes the whole *Iliad* was 'zusammengedichtet' in the sixth century.—1918, pp. 321-43. J. J. Hartman, *De Plutarcho scriptore et philosopho* [Leyden, 1916. M. 15] (M. Pohlenz). The author lives in, and for, his subject. His portrait of Plutarch is essentially subjective, as are his standards for admitting or denying the genuineness of doubtful treatises. H. is almost totally ignorant of modern research, both on the internal evidence for the order and circumstances in which Plutarch's works were written and in textual criticism. In the latter department he deserves thanks for several convincing emendations, but is apt elsewhere to miss the point, and is too ready with his 'amputation knife'.—1918, pp. 305-16. Ernst Nachmanson, *Erotianstudien* [Uppsala and Leipzig, 1917. M. 35] (J. Ilberg). Introductory studies to his forthcoming edition

of Erotian's glossary on Hippokrates. A most important contribution to the study of Greek medical writings; learned, well arranged, and admirably indexed.

LATIN LITERATURE.—1918, pp. 274-305. Carolus U. Clark, *Ammiani Marcellini rerum gestarum libri qui supersunt, recensuit rhythmicèque distinxit*. Vol. II. pars. I. Libri XXVI.—XXXI. [Berlin, 1915. M. 8] (E. Bickel). This edition, though achieving a considerable advance in many ways, leaves room for improvement alike in method, in arrangement of the critical apparatus, and in the system of orthography followed. B. discusses the influence of Cicero, Seneca, and others on the vocabulary of Ammianus.

PHILOSOPHY.—1919, pp. 301-14. Richard Högnigswald, *Die Philosophie des Altertums* [München, 1917. M. 13] (Bruno Bauch). A stimulating and individualistic piece of work, essentially consisting of 'problemgeschichtliche Untersuchungen.'

PHILOLOGISCHE WOCHENSCHRIFT.

(JANUARY—MARCH, 1921.)

GREEK LITERATURE. — H. Meyer-Benfey, *Sophokles' Antigone* (Seeliger). Contains many fruitful suggestions; reviewer disagrees with author's main contention that Kreon is the real hero, and gives reasons for dating Oedipus Tyrannus before Antigone.—J. T. Sheppard, *The Oedipus Tyrannus of Sophocles* (Wecklein). Has achieved his object of giving an ethical and psychological rather than an aesthetic explanation of the tragedy; reviewer not entirely satisfied with the grammatical and critical notes.—H. Frey, *Der Bios Euprimidov des Satyros* (Wecklein). Thorough and acute, but hampered by scanty and fragmentary material.—G. Norwood, *Greek Tragedy* (Dörpfeld). Good and comprehensive survey of everything connected with Greek theatre, with an account of all the Greek tragedies; where experts still differ, all views given impartially; reviewer disagrees with N.'s interpretation of ἐκκυκλημα.—A. Lörcher, *Wie, wo, wann ist die Ilias entstanden?* (Bethe). Follows 'psychological method' in grappling with Homeric problem; reviewer agrees in the main with L.'s conclusions as to date, home, and unity of *Iliad*, but also discusses many points of difference.—N. Wecklein, *Die homerischen Hymnen und die griechischen Tragiker* (Eberhard). Influence of Homeric Hymns does not appear in Aeschylus; in Sophocles and Euripides the case is quite different. Many textual emendations, of which reviewer cites a few. Most instructive and stimulating.—Luise Reinhard, *Die Anakoluthe bei Platon* (Seeliger). Author's desire to leave nothing unexplained often leads her to far-fetched, extravagant, and even incorrect interpretations; chief merit is the collection of examples.—W. v. Christ, *Geschichte der griechischen Literatur*, 6th Ed., Part II., i (K. F. W. Schmidt). New edition has grown from 506 to 662 pages; many corrections and additions, based on results of recent research and discoveries.

LATIN LITERATURE.—O. Gebhardt, *Sallust als politischer Publizist während des Bürgerkrieges* (Kurfess). Sound and acute work, based on hitherto neglected ancient evidence.

—R. Neumann, *Qua ratione Ovidius in Amoris scribendis Propertii elegiis usus sit* (Magnus). This industrious work gives a consistent and complete account of the relations of the two poets; N.'s Latin style is very inadequate.

—E. Flinck, *De Octaviae praelectae auctore* (Tolkiehn). Thorough piece of work; reviewer agrees with F. in attributing the Octavia to Seneca.

—L. Wiener, *Tacitus' Germania and other forgeries* (Wolff). Germans will prefer their proved guides (Müllenhoff, Norden, etc.) to this new 'light' in the west.

—L. Wilser, *Denkmäler deutscher Geschichte*, IV. C. Velleius Paterculus; V. Des P. Cornelius Tacitus *Jahrbücher und Geschichten* (Bock). Translation and commentary are in same style and of same quality as in the preceding three volumes of this series.

HISTORY AND BIOGRAPHY.—E. Kornemann, *Mausoleum und Tatenbericht des Augustus* (Gardthausen). Mainly an attempt to sift out the original draft ('Urmonument') of the Monum. Ancyranum; reviewer does not believe convincing results are possible.

—E. Norden, *Die germanische Urgeschichte in Tacitus' Germania* (L. Schmidt). The first comprehensive attempt to solve, by a thorough examination of Tacitus' relation to his predecessors, the many ethnographical problems in the Germania; rich and for the most part conclusive results; reviewer, however, discusses questions on which he disagrees with N.'s views.

—A. Rostagni, *Giuliano L'Apostata* (Asmus). A new feature is the earnest attempt to draw a portrait of Julian as he is revealed in his writings; warmly recommended.

—A. Dopsch, *Wirtschaftliche und soziale Grundlagen der europäischen Kultur-entwicklung* (Philipp). D.'s object is to trace the development of mediaeval civilisation from that of Rome.

PHILOSOPHY.—M. Wundt, *Plotin* (Nestle). Materially furthers our knowledge of Plotinus, in whom W. sees rather a revivalist preacher than a systematic philosopher; his relations with Gallienus also carefully examined.

—H. F. Müller, *Dionysios, Proklos, Plotinos* (Nestle). Concludes that Dionysius and Proclus depend upon Plotinus in all essentials.

—V. Macchioro, *Zagreus; studi sull' Orfismo* (Gruppe). Ingenious, but uncritical application of evidence; reviewer discusses Orphic and other cults at some length.

ART.—A. Hagemann, *Griechische Panzerung; I. Der Metallharnisch* (B. A. Müller). Generally convincing account of the development of Greek metal defensive armour, with a careful list of objects preserved and 173 illustrations; reviewer in a long discussion suggests several additions and corrections.

—L. v. Sybel, *Frühgeschichtliche Kunst* (Thomsen). Clever sketch of Early Christian art; wonderfully copious references.—Nikos A. Bees, *Kunstgeschichtliche Untersuchungen über die Eulaliosfrage* (Sare). B.'s masterly investiga-

tions lead to results of the utmost importance for Byzantine art, especially wall-painting.

ARCHAEOLOGY.—C. Praschniker and A. Schöber, *Archäologische Forschungen in Albanien und Montenegro* (Pagenstecher). Important results from hitherto almost unknown districts; sites of towns divided into Greek, Greco-Illyrian, and Illyrian; description of their walls and other ruins, Roman forts, roads, bridges, inscriptions, etc., also some important sculptures, especially a small archaic Apollo from Durazzo.

METRIC.—T. Fitzhugh, *The Old-Latin and Old-Irish Monuments of Verse* (B. Klotz). Does not prove his case for Latin; firmer ground needed to build on.

EPIGRAPHY.—J. E. Sandys, *Latin Epigraphy* (Wissowa). Attractively written and useful as an introduction for beginners; uneven arrangement of material criticised, and omissions and errors discussed at length.

—J. Sundwall, *Der Ursprung der kretischen Schrift* (Hermann). Unconvincing attempt to trace Cretan pictographs to Egyptian originals.

GEOGRAPHY.—W. Kubitschek, *Itinerar-Studien* (Mentz). Completes list of itineraries given by him in Pauly-Wissowa, finds an itinerary in a list of towns in the *Commentarii Notarum Tironianarum*, and—his most comprehensive chapter—compares rivers mentioned by Ravennas and Tab. Peutingeriana; very valuable.

LAW.—P. M. Meyer, *Juristische Papyri* (Kübler). M. is well qualified to produce a book like this, in which he reveals his habitual accuracy and terseness: intended for historians and classical philologists as well as for students of law; the introductions and commentaries to the selections are first-rate.

—H. Kreller, *Erbrechtliche Untersuchungen auf Grund der Gräcoägyptischen Papyrusurkunden* (Kübler). Deserves unstinted praise in every respect; a complete exposition of right of inheritance as revealed by papyri; well arranged and provided with careful indices.

—L. Guenoun, *La cessio bonorum* (Kübler). Careful, thorough, and conscientious work; takes into account papyri, which were not available when Wlassak wrote his article for Pauly-Wissowa.

—F. v. Velsen, *Die legis actio per iudicis postulationem im alten Rom* (Kübler). A hasty, bungling piece of work, which reviewer criticises at length in the severest terms.

GENERAL.—L. Laurand, *Manuel des études grecques et latines*, 8 vols. (Stangl). Author is an unprejudiced scholar of ripe judgment and rare taste; essentials are carefully distinguished from subordinate matter, and there is no trace of obscurity or carelessness; general arrangement, paper, and print excellent. Contents: I. and IV., Greek and Roman geography, history, etc.; II. and V., History of Greek and Roman literature; III. and VI., Greek and Latin historical grammar; VII., Metre, textual criticism, epigraphy, archaeology, etc.; VIII., Indices. Very highly praised.

BOOKS RECEIVED

All publications which have a bearing on Classical Studies will be entered in this list if they are sent for review. The price should in all cases be stated.

* * Excerpts or Extracts from Periodicals and Collections will not be included unless they are also published separately.

- Acta Academiae Aboensis.* Humaniora I, containing: The Belief in Spirits in Morocco, by E. Westermarck, pp. 167; Der Ursprung der Kretischen Schrift, by Dr. J. Sundwall, pp. 25; Contributions to the Sociology of the Indian Tribes of Ecuador, by R. Karsten, pp. 75; Beiträge zur Sittengeschichte der Südamerikanischen Indianer, by Dr. R. Karsten, pp. 104; Papuan Magic in the Building of Houses, by G. Landman, pp. 28; Die Magie des Webens und des Webstuhls im Schwedischen Volksglauben, by K. R. V. Wikman. Pp. 21. Åbo Akademi, 1920.
- Bibliothèque de l'École des Hautes Études.* Recherches sur l'Épée attique et en Particulier sur la Date de l'Institution. By Alice Brenot. Pp. xxviii+52. La Table Hypothécaire de Veleia, Étude sur la Propriété Foncière dans l'Apennin de Plaisance. By F. G. de Pachtère. Pp. xix+119. 10" x 6½". Paris: Librairie Ancienne Honoré Champion, 1920.
- Boll (F.)* Vita Contemplativa. 9½" x 6½". Pp. 34. Heideberg: Carl Winters, 1920. M. 2.
- Brautlich (A. F.)* The Indicative Indirect Question in Latin. 9½" x 6½". Pp. xxxi+211. Chicago: University Press, 1920. Private edition.
- Cagnat (R.) and Chapot (V.)* Manuel d'Archéologie Romaine. Vol. 2. 9" x 5½". Pp. vi+574. Paris: Picard, 1920. Fr. 30.
- Classical Philology.* January, 1921. Chicago: University Press.
- Donovan (J.)* Theory of Advanced Greek Prose Composition. Part I. 8½" x 5½". Pp. 124. Oxford: Blackwell, 1921. Paper boards, 5s. net.
- Ferrar (W. J.)* The Proof of the Gospel. 2 Vols. 7½" x 5". Vol. I., pp. xi+271; Vol. II., pp. 257. London: S.P.C.K., 1920. 2 vols., cloth, 30s. net.
- Flinck (E.)* Auguralia und Verwandtes. 9½" x 6½". Pp. 76. Helsingfors Hielaniemenkatu 3, Dr. E. Flinck, 1921.
- Gomme (A. W.)* Mr. Wells as Historian. 9" x 5½". Pp. 48. Glasgow: MacLehose, Jackson and Co., 1921. 2s. net.
- Harvard Studies in Classical Philology.* Vol. XXXI. 9" x 6". Pp. 169. Oxford: University Press, 1920. Paper boards, 6s. 6d. net.
- Krumbacher (A.)* Die Stimmgebung der Redner in Altertum bis auf die Zeit Quintilians. 9½" x 6". Pp. 108. Paderborn: F. Schöningh, 1921. M. 7½.
- Legge (F.)* Philosophumena; or, The Refutation of all Heresies. 2 Vols. 7½" x 5". Vol. I., pp. vi+180; Vol. II., pp. vi+189. London: S.P.C.K., 1921. Cloth, 30s. net.
- Loeb Classical Library: Rolfe (J. C.)* Sallust. Pp. xxii+535. Butler (H. E.) Quintilian. Vol. I. Pp. xiv+544. Fowler (H. N.) Plato. Vol. II. Pp. vii+459. Godley (A. D.) Herodotus. Vol. I. Pp. xxi+504. 6½" x 4½". Cloth, 10s. net each.
- Ludovici (A. M.)* Man's Descent from the Gods. 9" x 6½". Pp. xiii+255. London: Heinemann, 1921. Cloth, 14s. net.
- Macdonald (G.)* F. Haverfield, 1860-1919. 9½" x 6". Pp. 18. Published by Oxford University Press for the British Academy, 1921. 2s. net.
- Marouzeau (J.)* La Linguistique ou Science du Langage. 7½" x 4½". Pp. 190. Paris: Librairie Geuthner, 1921. Fr. 7.50.
- Meillet (A.)* Linguistique Historique et Linguistique Générale. Pp. viii+335. Paris: Librairie Ancienne Honoré Champion, 1921.
- Modern Greek Grammar.* Translated by W. H. D. Rouse. 8" x 5". Pp. xii+256. Heidelberg: Julius Groos, 1921.
- P. Ovidi Nasonis Fastorum.* Liber III. Edited by C. Bailey. 7½" x 5". Pp. 141. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1921. Cloth, 4s. 6d. net.
- Peterson (T.)* Cicero. A Biography. 9½" x 6½". Pp. vi+699. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1920. Cloth, 5s.
- Pharr (C.)* Homeric Greek. 8" x 5½". Pp. xliii+400. London: Harrap and Co., 1921. Cloth, 8s. 6d. net.
- Price (A. C.)* Homer: Iliad, Book XXI. 7" x 4½". Pp. li+60. Cambridge: University Press, 1921. Cloth, 4s. 6d. net.
- Q. Asconii Pediani Commentarii.* Edited by Caesar Giarratano. 10" x 7". Pp. xx+112. Rome: A. Narddecchia, 1920.
- Russell (C. H. St. L.)* The Tradition of the Roman Empire. 7½" x 5". Pp. viii+280. London: Macmillan, 1921. Cloth, 6s. net.
- Selections from Catullus.* Edited by M. Macmillan. 6½" x 4½". Pp. 124. Oxford: University Press. Paper boards, 2s. net.
- Stail (G.)* Über die Pseudoxenophontische. ΑΘΗΝΑΙΩΝ ΠΟΛΙΤΕΙΑ. 9½" x 6½". Pp. 134. Paderborn: F. Schöningh, 1921. M. 7.60.
- Sundwall (J.)* Zur Deutung Kretischer Tontäfelchen. 9½" x 6½". Pp. 12. Åbo Akademi, 1920.
- The Homeric Catalogue of Ships.* Edited by T. W. Allen. 9" x 6". Pp. xi+191. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1921. Cloth, 16s. net.
- Thomson (J. A. K.)* Greeks and Barbarians. 8" x 5½". Pp. 218. London: Allen and Unwin, 1921. Cloth, 8s. 6d. net.
- Toynbee (A. J.)* The Tragedy of Greece. 7½" x 5". Pp. 42. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1921. 2s. net.
- Traube (L.)* Vorlesungen und Abhandlungen. Part III. 10" x 7". Pp. xvi+334. München: C. H. Beck, 1920. M. 21.91.
- Walker (E. M.)* Greek History. 6½" x 4½". Pp. 165. Oxford: Blackwell, 1921. Paper boards, 3s. 6d. net.
- Walker (R. J.)* Euripidean Fragments. 9" x 6". Pp. 52. London: Burns, Oates and Washbourne, 1920. Half cloth and paper boards. 7s. 6d. net.
- Walker (R. J.)* The Macedonian Tetralogy of Euripides. 9" x 6". Pp. 139. London: Burns, Oates and Washbourne, 1920. Half cloth and paper boards. 12s. 6d. net.

